

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolutions.

The Secretary read the resolutions (S. Res. 321), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JACOB EDWIN MEEKER, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Senators be appointed by the Vice President, to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives, to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolution the Presiding Officer appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. REED, Mr. WILFLEY, Mr. WATSON, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. NEW, Mr. KENYON, Mr. HARBING, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. KIRBY, and Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. WILFLEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 21, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, October 17, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whom we have been taught to worship as Father, we bless Thee for the rich and varied endowments of mind and soul which constitute us progressive beings, lifting us to clearer visions of Thee and the laws which environ us and hast made character the supreme test.

Make us strong in our convictions, pure in our desires, and thus lead us onward and upward to a closer relationship with Thee.

Again, O God, our Heavenly Father, are we reminded of the brief tenure of this life by the sudden and unexpected death of a Member of this legislative body. Strengthen our faith and that of his friends and admirers, especially those to whom he was nearest and dearest, in the larger life to which he has been called and to which we are all rapidly tending and fit us for the inevitable change.

"It lies around us like a cloud,
A world we do not see;
Yet the sweet closing of an eye
May bring us there to be.

"Sweet hearts around us throb and beat,
Sweet helping hands are stirred,
And palpitates the veil between
With breathings almost heard."

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Upon what subject?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To include an address made by me on waterways.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on waterways. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13086, the first deficiency bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Let me say to the gentleman that I have applications for time by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] for 10 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] for 15 minutes, and for safety I think the gentleman had better make the request for 30 minutes, and the last 5 perhaps will not be used.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 45 minutes, reserving 15 minutes for myself.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, the gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 45 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Thirty minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and 15 minutes by myself.

Mr. HEFLIN. Reserving the right to object, I may want 10 minutes' time myself.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman knows how to get it, does he not?

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. That general debate be limited to 45 minutes, 30 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Kentucky. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky if there will be any chance for my getting 10 minutes? I do not know that I want to speak, but I would like to have it reserved if necessary.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am simply following the evident wish of the House in trying to expedite the consideration of the bill. I yesterday took considerable time myself, but I took it for the purpose of the explanation of the bill, and only that, without in any sense diverging from that purpose. I had hoped that we might go on with the reading of the bill this morning, and that such debate as might be necessary might develop under the five-minute rule. I think I may be able to give the gentleman from Alabama 5 or 10 minutes out of the 15 I have reserved if he thinks that he needs it. But unless he now knows that he wants it, I suggest that we go along under the request that I have made.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I will not object, and leave it to the gentleman from Kentucky to give me the time if I want it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee was then agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13086, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate that the chairman is anxious to get along with this bill, and I will not take up any more time of the House than I absolutely have to.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill authorizes appropriations aggregating \$6,345,755,666.04. When we consider that the bonded indebtedness of the United States on October 31, 1865, was only \$1,163,769,611.89 (Spaulding's Financial History of the War, p. 201), and that our governmental expenditures from January 1, 1791, to January 1, 1914, only totaled approximately \$28,000,000,000 (Dewey's Financial History of the United States), and that this bill is merely a deficiency measure, it is apparent that our present rate of public expenditures is quite beyond human conception. The aggregate expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, under existing estimates, will probably exceed \$35,000,000,000, of which amount the War Department will undoubtedly get at least \$25,000,000,000. An annual expenditure of \$35,000,000,000 means in round figures \$96,000,000 per day, \$4,000,000 per hour, \$66,000 per minute, and \$1,100 every second.

I do not speak in any spirit of criticism, but from a sense of duty and responsibility as a Member of the House. I speak as a Member who has supported every war measure demanded by the Executive for the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war. The President says that we must win the war. I stand upon that platform with all my heart and soul. It is our duty, in time of war in the prosecution thereof, to sustain and hold up the hands of the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, whoever he may be. It is the imperative duty of all loyal American citizens in this great crisis to concentrate all their thoughts, all their energies, and all their resources into an irresistible unit for the sole purpose of bringing the war to a speedy conclusion by victory.

We must not forget, however, that in the minds of the American people exists this question: "Are public funds being wisely, economically, and lawfully expended?" You on the other side of the aisle will soon find out that you are making a great mistake in getting so absorbed in your greed for a continuance in power that you will not see what even the blind can feel. Public sentiment is rapidly crystallizing upon this

question, and demands not only that the Congress adopt the budget system, but that the Congress exercise careful supervision over the expenditure of public moneys, and take reasonable precautions against waste, extravagance, and unlawfulness.

The Syracuse Post-Standard on September 24, 1918, contained the following editorial:

A COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES.

The committee of the House of Representatives which ranks first in importance is Ways and Means; it determines how the money necessary for the support of government shall be raised. Next in importance is the Committee on Appropriations; it determines generally where the money shall go. There is no committee on expenditures to see that the money is honestly and wisely spent.

The proposition that the House shall have a committee on expenditures with the broadest powers of audit, completing with the Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees the circle of legislative control of the Nation's purse, has come before the present Congress as usual. Our own Congressman, Mr. MAGEE, we are glad to say, made a convincing plea for it. The House rejected the proposal as usual. That the United States Government should have the essentials of a budget system necessary for the conduct of all corporate business is apparently not to be considered.

There are committees on expenditures to be sure. Their number is their condemnation; one for each of the 10 departments whose heads are in the Cabinet, one for public buildings, none for any of the multitude of other agencies for the spending of money. The chairmen of the 11 committees, working independently, do not take their duties very seriously, but they all have fine committee rooms.

To do away with all these committees and substitute a committee on expenditures, with power to hold every department of Government to strict accountability for its expenditures, would be statesmanship.

The New York Tribune on September 23, 1918, contained the following editorial:

DODGING THE INEVITABLE.

The House of Representatives has once more refused to create a committee on war expenditures. The House usually shrinks from modernizing its procedure and conforming its methods of doing business to new requirements. A committee on expenditures would be a radical innovation. Therefore the majority in the present House will have none of it. This fear is unreasonable. It obstructs a recasting of the relations of the legislative branch to appropriations and expenditures which our war experience has made inevitable. We could blunder along without a budget system and without a rational apportionment of responsibility for our national outlay while we were spending only \$1,000,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000 a year. But it is preposterous to go ahead spending \$20,000,000,000 or \$25,000,000,000 a year without the safeguards of administrative accountability and legislative audit and control.

We have been proceeding on the mistaken theory that Congress is competent to originate and determine down to the last detail the expenditures of the executive branch, and that it is a normal function of the executive to audit its own expense accounts. Chaos naturally results from such a confusion of duties. It is only a form of words to say that the House and Senate appropriation committees any longer decide what the executive departments are to spend. More than ever before the legislative committees merely register the decisions of executive officials. It could not be otherwise. Secretary McAdoo has even intervened to control the details of taxation and of other revenue legislation. And he has a logical right to do so. Under any well-considered fiscal scheme the executive ought to accept full responsibility for the outlay necessary to carry out its plans. Congress really takes over a routine administrative function when it decides of its own motion what ought to be spent by each department, bureau, commission, and so on down to the pettiest agency of government.

Under an intelligent budget system Congress would merely vote appropriations in the mass. That would end forever the dangerous fiction which permits the administration to wash its hands of all accountability for the sum total of appropriations. But having fixed that responsibility where it belongs, Congress would be entitled to assume the broadest possible powers of audit. Having voted the money, it would see to it that that money was wisely and profitably spent. Congress can not function efficiently until it creates a real committee on expenditures, supplanting the various make-believe committees on expenditures in the various departments carried for window-dressing purposes, in its present organization.

The House and the Senate should actually "hold the purse" through a strict auditing of accounts. Congress is the natural forum in which to discuss and settle all questions as to the wisdom and usefulness of national outlay.

Think of the enormous gain in economy and in public morale which would result if Congressmen were limited to the rôle of critics of expenditure and were effectually barred from acting as promoters of public building, river and harbor, and other "pork-barrel" extravaganzas for the benefit of local interests. This Congress is too deep in the rut of the past to feel the need of new methods and a new outlook. If the Republicans carry the next House they can do nothing more timely and constructive than to create that vital auditing committee at which the torpor and timidity of the present Congress balk.

Under date of September 14, 1918, the committee on State and municipal taxation of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in its report on the pending revenue bill, said, in part:

Any tax system, especially in times of stress, which has a recognized tendency to produce profligacy and corruption, should be supplemented by measures to check these evils. Your committee believes that the House of Representatives should establish a vigorous auditing committee, amply provided with assistance and authority and under the chairmanship of a member of the minority party.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE. I have only a little time, and will be glad to yield if the gentleman can get me more time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I was just going to ask why you did not adopt the budget system when the Republican Party was in power? [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MAGEE. Under the Republican Party there was a commission on Economy and Efficiency appointed, and President

Taft sent a message to the Congress approving the report of that commission.

Mr. HASTINGS. You were in power for 40 years and you never attempted it.

Mr. MAGEE. When public sentiment began to crystallize a Republican administration created a Commission on Economy and Efficiency on "the need for a national budget." On June 27, 1912, President Taft sent a message to the Congress approving the recommendations of the commission and recommended to the Congress the enactment of the legislation necessary to put into effect such recommendations. A Democratic administration starved to death the commission.

My contention is that it is as necessary to conserve our financial resources as our food products. Our people give without stint, but we can retain their absolute confidence only by showing them that the funds given have been wisely and lawfully expended. They are at least entitled to that, and we shirk our responsibility when we persistently refuse to render any accounting of public expenditures.

The administration has obtained the services of a former justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, one of the great lawyers of the country, to determine where a few financial drops have gone. I am unwilling to concede that we have not sufficient ability and intelligence in the membership of the House to investigate and make an efficient report upon public expenditures. My observation is that the membership of the House contains its fair share of the best business ability and best legal talent in the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does not the gentleman think also that the House would know best where to go to get that information?

Mr. MAGEE. Yes. I appreciate that the Committee on Appropriations in the preparation of this bill has been painstaking, conscientious, and performed excellent service. But that does not meet the situation. We have no authoritative body to investigate public expenditures and furnish any information to the House. We simply have to shut our eyes and vote.

We must sustain and back up our incomparable soldiers overseas to the utmost limit of the Nation's resources. I feel that it was at Chateau-Thierry, the gateway to Paris, where through the heroism of American soldiers the German offensive ended and the Foch offensive began. We all must feel that the soldiers of America fighting under the Stars and Stripes alongside of the union jack of sturdy England and the tricolor of glorious France will prove the determining factor in this war; and all must rejoice to see that the spirit of '76 still exists in the youth of America.

This is what a young French woman, Miss Vromet, now taking special courses at Syracuse University, says of our boys:

At the Battle of Chateau-Thierry my brother fought beside American soldiers for the first time, and he told us that the Americans fight like lions.

[Applause.]

Our soldiers and sailors overseas and at home must be supplied with the best of everything. Consequently it behooves us to economize in the expenditure of public funds and to make it our particular business to stop profiteering everywhere. We can not do this unless we adopt efficient means therefor. In a speech in the House on April 6, 1918, I pointed out how the great committee on public accounts in the House of Commons had been an absolute check on waste, extravagance, and unlawful expenditures. We imperatively need such a committee here. Your refusal, gentlemen across the aisle, to take some means to supervise public expenditures will prove your undoing. You have seen the lightning flash in the recent elections in Maine, and you will hear the thunder roar in New York in November next. If we vote throughout the State by ballot, it may take until near Christmas to count the Republican vote. [Applause on the Republican side.]

As was stated by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the American people are amazingly unified in their determination to push the war to a speedy and successful conclusion. This is due in a large part, I think, to the fact that war was made upon us. When the Congress on April 6, 1917, declared that a state of war existed between the United States and the Imperial German Government, we all had vividly in mind the ruthless attacks without warning by Germany upon our unarmed merchant ships, flying the Stars and Stripes and peacefully sailing upon the high seas where they had the lawful right to be. That was the great mistake of Germany that doomed her to defeat. She ought to have known that every loyal American citizen would spend the last dollar and sacrifice the last man, if need be, to protect Old Glory wherever it might float upon any land or upon any sea. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is doubtful if at any time in the experience of people with self-government their representatives have so united for a single purpose as have the representatives of the American people for the successful conduct of this war. To accomplish that purpose partisanship and personal ambitions have been set aside. Marvelous things have been done since this Congress convened on the 2d of April, 1917. It is almost inconceivable that the amount of work that has been done could have been accomplished. We have raised and authorized appropriations or appropriated well onto \$50,000,000,000. We have provided for the raising of the greatest Army ever marshaled in so short a time. We have increased our Navy and perfected our fighting organizations on land and sea. Our armies are in action. Our Navy has accomplished what Germany thought was impossible. We have taken an army overseas in safety. All these great things have been authorized and provided for by work done on this floor. And there has been no party distinction. Unlike any other war, in the history of this or perhaps any other country, there has been no minority party. The party in power has had the cooperation of the minority party in the enactment of every measure essential in the conduct of the war. The President has been ungrudgingly granted every war power he has asked that was essential. I am sure every other Member of the House has felt as I have felt and worked and voted as I have voted for every war measure as a solemn duty to meet a grave responsibility. One seated in the galleries would not know the leader of the majority from the leader of the minority or the members of the majority from the members of the minority by what has been said and done. On war matters amendments offered or voted for, all votes cast have been without party distinction. And yet, while Members are here aiding in this way in the conduct of the war, some persons are campaigning against them upon the ground that their defeat is necessary to aid in the conduct of the war. Votes cast for or against amendments in the great mass of legislation that has been enacted, amendments inconsequential in their general effect as war measures, are cited as reasons why this should be done. Votes to recommit bills for amendment are falsely stated to be votes against the bills. To illustrate: A short time ago we passed what is known as the man-power bill. Many Members had serious doubts as to the wisdom of including the 18-year old boys among those first to be sent to the trenches.

The Secretary of War and the President had said it was not the intention of the administration to send the 18-year-old boys until the others in the call had been exhausted. In order to make assurances doubly sure that this intent of the administration should be carried out, an amendment was provided for in a motion to recommit calling the 18-year-old boys last. Many of us voted for this motion. The amendment was not carried, but the President within 24 hours after the man-power bill was passed, did what he had said had been the purpose of the War Department and what Members voted for—gave the 18-year-old boys deferred classification. And yet there are men going about in congressional districts to-day saying that this or that Member voted against the man-power bill, voted against raising the necessary men to carry on the war. Of course, the men or set of men, or the newspapers that state or publish such things know they are making a bold attempt to deceive the people by grossly misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. Chairman, whatever the result of this election may be, as to the control of this House, whether the majority shall move from one side of this aisle to the other, the conduct of the war, if it has not been concluded, will go on. I am confident, however, that a Republican House and a Republican Senate will give confidence to the country and impetus to the conduct of the war. We will look into the expenditures of the money that has already been appropriated and that shall be appropriated in the future. I have believed from the beginning that committees of Congress should have made the closest inquiry into the manner in which money has been expended. The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department should have kept the closest watch on the expenditure of money by the War Department. We should have stricken with terror those who contemplated graft or were misapplying funds. It is doubtful if there would have been the waste or worse than waste of \$640,000,000 for airplanes if those who had the responsibility for expending the money knew that every step they were taking was being followed up by committees of Congress, the body that appropriated the money. I believe that in the next Congress, with the majority upon this side and such expenditures being carefully watched, not to embarrass, not to hinder, but to insure economy and honesty in the expenditure of public funds we shall save money and expose graft wherever it exists.

Great things are to be done in the future. The greatest problems that have ever confronted mankind will follow upon peace,

the dawn of which is reddening in the East. I confidently believe that the constructive forces of this Nation, those with a legislative vision and purpose to maintain a high plane of living and wages and prosperous conditions for the laborers and industries of the country when the country is on a peace basis, are on this side of the House.

For this reason alone, if for no other, the American people will act wisely if they change the leadership from one side of this aisle to the other—from you to us. I do not say this to you in a bitter partisan way. I believe the constructive legislation of the Republican Party in the past half century amply justifies the statement I have made. Nothing has demonstrated itself more forcefully than this: This Nation and the world are getting the benefit of the results of the constructive legislation of the last half century. Civilization has been benefited by the billions of money that have been created by the inspiration of that legislation under the leadership of the Republican Party. The great wealth that has been accumulated, the great resources that have been developed as the result of wise laws have made it possible for our Government to expend billions on our own account, to lend other billions to our allies, and to send materials and food to all the world, and in this way to make possible the triumphant victory the allied armies are now approaching. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the first speaker on the Republican side this morning [Mr. MAGEE] has the best record of any Republican in the House for loyal and whole-hearted support of the administration. If his Republican colleagues had his record, they could go with better grace to their constituents and ask for reelection. But the gentleman from New York allowed his partisan zeal to lead him, even in the face of his party's record in this House, to urge that the next House should be Republican. Although he has voted with the Democrats nearly all the time, he now invites the country to return to "the good old days of Republican control."

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] makes a like appeal. He reminds us that constructive statesmanship is on the Republican side, and that the country should return to those glorious old days of Republican rule. These suggestions brought vividly back to me the recollections of the days of "Aldrichism" and "Cannonism," when Aldrich, the king of the Rubber Trust, the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, laid a tariff tax on rubber goods and taxed the American people to put money in his own pockets. I recalled the time when Ballinger, a member of the Republican Cabinet, was bartering the public domain of the West to Guggenheim and his kind. I recalled the time in those glorious old days when Lorimer had bought a seat in the Senate from the State of Illinois and was impeached by the Senate of the United States. These happy recollections of Republican misrule came trooping in upon my mind as these Republican gentlemen invited us to return to those old days.

In those old days waste and extravagance were rampant in Republican circles. The Republican President, Mr. Taft, said that you were wasting or squandering annually at least \$100,000,000. But Mr. Aldrich said that it was \$300,000,000—and you gentlemen have the gall to invite us to swap off this Democratic administration for that old Republican machine. Why, the power-hungry bosses of the Republican Party are doing everything in their power to get control of the Government. They are absolutely trying to buy seats in the House and Senate. Go to Michigan, Illinois, and Colorado, where your millionaire candidates are relying for election not upon the patriotism of the people but upon their power to buy the elections. In the State of Michigan the patriots who believe in clean elections were unable to get Republican officials to investigate the corrupt use of money in the recent Republican senatorial primary and the Federal court in New York summoned witnesses there. They have brought them into court, and when the constituted authority of the country said, "Gentleman, where did you get this money and how was it used?" they said, "We decline to tell you." "Take them to jail," said the judge. "All right, we will go to jail, but we will not tell who furnished the money." Three of them were sent to jail by the judge in New York yesterday. Buying and selling seats in the United States Senate and then defying the constituted authorities of the country.

When our boys are fighting and dying in France for our country, for God's sake let us refuse to sell or surrender the country to these profiteers and corruptionists here at home! [Applause.]

Do you know what you would do if you got control of this House and the Senate? I will tell you what would happen. You would begin at once your presidential campaign and for two years you would hamper and hamstring the great President

and defeat his great measures while you played your game of 1920 politics.

Is the country ready for such a miserable performance? It is suggested that if you get control of the House and Senate that one of your candidates for President will come to Washington and dictate your policies—one of which will be to tie the hands of the President of the United States.

President Wilson has not had the loyal support of the Republican side. There is no use of trying to deceive yourselves or the country. Why, one of your number [Mr. MASON of Illinois] offered a bill to tie the President's hands and stop the Army at the ocean's side, and no Republican in either branch of Congress ever condemned that act. One of you Republicans [Mr. BRITTEN of Illinois] offered a bill to exempt American boys of German and Austrian blood from service to that flag on a foreign field, and no one of you on that side, or in the other branch, ever condemned that act. One hundred and eighty-six of you voted to exempt excessive profits from the provisions of the war-tax bill. Many of you supported the Cooper resolution. Many of you supported the McLemore resolution, and many of you voted against measures that the President wanted passed to aid him in the conduct of the war.

Gentlemen, let us be fair with ourselves and with the country. It would be nothing short of a national calamity, and an international disaster, for the Republican Party to get control of this House and the Senate at this critical time. Let President Wilson have both branches of Congress until this war is over. Lincoln had them, McKinley had them, and Wilson has them, and he is going to have them after the next election. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is no doubt about that. I make you the prediction here to-day that we will have this House by over 50 majority. A good many of you will not, and should not, come back. You place partisan success above the welfare of your country. Gentlemen, the country is aroused from one end to the other. The patriotism of the people is stirred as never before, and they do not propose that this House shall be turned over now to the money-grabbing, profiteering element of this country.

Why is it that these men are putting up millions back of you? Because they have been required to pay large sums of war taxes. They want to get control of the taxing power. They want to exempt themselves and put the burden upon the other fellow. The voter who sits in the audiences in this fall campaign and listens to the talk of turning this Government over to the constructive statesmen referred to by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] will say, "God of our fathers, deliver me from such a fate!" No; gentlemen; let us stand by this great Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. Let us give him whole-hearted support. Let us keep the party in power that was in power when the war commenced, that was in power when we entered the war, and that is now conducting the war successfully. Let us stand by that party until the war is won. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, under leave just granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to submit the following:

"The issue in 1918 is, Are we going to stand by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy? His party was in power when the war came on; his party was in power when our country entered the war; and his party should remain in power until the war is won.

"The Republican Party leaders, in their efforts to defeat and turn out the party now in control, are responsible for the injection of partisan politics into this campaign.

"Suppose the Republicans had been in power when the war commenced and were in power now, and the Democrats should now be engaged in a campaign to drive them from power, what do you suppose these Republican leaders would say? Why, they would accuse us of being disloyal and they would stoutly contend that to elect a Democratic House and Senate under the circumstances would be doing precisely what Germany wanted done. I want to say, as an American to Americans, that to defeat the President's party in the coming election would be nothing short of a public calamity, and it would be seized upon and exploited by Germany as a repudiation of the President and his war program, and the country would be injured by such a course. I submit to the intelligent and patriotic people of the United States that it is right and proper that the party in power charged directly with the responsibility for the conduct of the war, and especially when the war is being successfully carried on, should be kept in power by the American people. One thing is certain, and that is, that every half-hearted American and every German sympathizer in the United States is going to vote the Republican ticket in the coming election. German spies and agents are hoping to be able to tell the

allies of Germany that President Wilson and his party, the party in power, have been repudiated by the American people.

"Democrats can truthfully say that under our control the war is being carried on in a wonderfully successful manner, and therefore with perfect propriety we can ask the American people to indorse the work and leadership that have brought success to our arms, but when the Republicans under the circumstances ask to have the party in power repudiated they are guilty of injecting partisan politics into the very issues of the life and death of the Republic. Democrats simply ask for an indorsement of service, which has been indorsed and warmly praised by the allies and which has resulted in victory for our flag, but Republican politicians, when they ask for a repudiation of the party in power, show a disposition to place partisan success above the welfare of the country, and if Republicans were in power at this time and Democrats sought to do such a thing they would be guilty of the same great evil. I want to say again that President McKinley, Col. Roosevelt, and ex-President Harrison, during the Spanish-American War, appealed to the American people to give President McKinley a Republican House and Senate and the people did so by an overwhelming vote. Then we were at war with Spain, a small power. If it were necessary then to support and keep in power the Republican Party, the party in power when the war came on, how much more important now when the very life of our Nation is at stake and the civilization of the world is threatened to stand by Woodrow Wilson and retain his party in power. In many important instances Republican leaders and Members have opposed the President's program just as far as they dared to go, and after trying to defeat many of his measures as we considered the bills section by section and seeing that they had failed, in order to save themselves at home they have voted for some of them on the final roll call. From another viewpoint it would be nothing short of a national calamity to turn over the taxing power to the men who want to get rich and enormously rich out of this war, and the fact that they are supporting the Republican bosses now is proof enough that they have been assured that the war-tax burden will be shifted from the shoulders of those most able to pay to the shoulders of those least able to pay and that instead of being required to pay a considerable portion of their immense profits they will be relieved of that burden almost entirely while Republicans unload it upon the backs of the American masses.

"This is a question—a very important question—that should and will be seriously considered by the voter in the coming election. Surely the men who are making tremendous profits and stupendous fortunes because of the war should be willing—and if not willing, should be required—to contribute a fair and just portion to the Government and its soldiers who are carrying on the war. This the Democratic Party has insisted should be done, and this the Democratic Party has succeeded in doing, and that is why some of these big greedy fellows, making millions in war profits, and who are required to pay to the Government a fair portion of what they get, are now secretly contributing thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars to the campaign funds of the Republican Party. They had rather give to the Republican campaign fund a hundred thousand dollars for sordid purposes than to pay to the Government a million dollars in taxes to support the cause involving the very life of the Nation. It is whispered around in many quarters that the Republicans have the largest campaign fund that they have ever had. No one who has been about the Capitol in recent months doubts that. The pompous profiteer, sore because the law requires him to turn over to the Government a considerable portion of his profit in taxes, is now seeking relief at the hands of the hungry bosses of the Republican Party, and they, without a moment's hesitation, these power-hungry bosses, are ready to agree to use the taxing power of the Republic to enable a favored few to escape their fair share of the Nation's war burden, and this is to be done, we are told, at the expense and great injury of the American masses whose boys are fighting and dying for our country. While our boys on a foreign field are fighting and dying for our country God forbid that we shall sell it or surrender it to plutocracy and predatory interests at home. The ghouls and vultures and vampires that always appear at a time like this are not only taking advantage of a condition produced by war while they fatten upon the distress and misfortune of their country, but they are now seeking to get control of the Government itself, so that they can suck and drain its lifeblood to feed their putrid veins."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have five minutes, and I will ask the Chair to call me down at the expiration of one. I desire to yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

In that one minute I wish to say this: I think the President of the United States can survive, notwithstanding his self-con-

stituted chief defender, in season and out of season, rushes in and performs and appeals to "the God of our fathers." And we on this side can survive, notwithstanding his attack. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that what I am going to say will do any good, any more than what I have already said on the same subject has accomplished anything, but inasmuch as I once started out to give the details of this little transaction, I want to conclude it. I described some time ago on the floor of the House a case where a soldier had made a certain allotment to his wife. The wife, not knowing it, after he had gone also applied for the allotment, giving her first name a little different in spelling, though not in sound, and a little different address from the one that her soldier husband had given, though in the same town. Month after month she has been receiving two checks, one check to her under the first name, which she had given, and the other check with the first name which her husband had destined for her, but both on the face as wife of the same soldier. Being an honest woman, she wrote back monthly, telling the circumstances and returning one of the checks. But it made no difference. Both monthly checks continued to come to her. Finally she wrote to her Congressman, and I thought it well to bring before the House the circumstances and also in that way to make it public, and I thought it might call the attention of the Treasury Department to the matter. And I thought also, perhaps, returning the check by her Congressman might have a little more effect than returning it by herself. But apparently there is no means of stopping this generosity of the United States Government, because I have just heard that again has come to her the two checks. [Laughter.]

I do not remember the exact amount, and I will not attempt to give it, but they were two sizeable checks; and again, this honest, self-sacrificing woman sends back the duplicate, which she thinks does not belong to her, because she thinks the Government might make use of it otherwise. I call attention to the matter again, hoping that it will reach the Treasury Department and be remedied. I appreciate their difficulties, but I do hope that it may reach them and that this particular case may be remedied.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is just possible that the gentleman's constituent herself may be mistaken. I know nothing about the facts; but, as the gentleman knows, there are certain allotments that are known as compulsory allotments, in the case of dependents, which are paid through the medium of the War-Risk Bureau, and then there are certain volunteer allotments which are paid through the medium of the War Department, and it is possible that the lady may be entitled under the law to both checks.

Mr. GILLET. I do not think it is possible in this case, but I will look into that particular phase of it, and if I find it so, I will be very glad to report so. But I fear very much that this is not the only case of that kind. The lady is certainly entitled to great commendation for her persistent industry in trying to put back into the Treasury the money she thinks belongs there. I can not help having an unpleasant misgiving as to how many other checks are going out to people who are not as honest as she is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

For temporary employees for the Civil Service Commission, \$150,000: *Provided*, That not more than four persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,400 per annum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this item and other items relating to the increase of clerical force in the departments in Washington are worthy of some consideration, and I rise to make an inquiry, because the matter was not referred to in the Committee on Appropriations inasmuch as it was regarded as a matter of incidental importance. And yet, I think the members of the legislative subcommittee will be interested in knowing what was the policy of the subcommittee on deficiencies in granting this large amount of \$150,000 for the Civil Service Commission. I believe there is another instance where the committee voted to the Department of State \$136,000 as additional deficiency appropriations for clerical services.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is no appropriation carried in this bill looking to the employment of additional employees in

Washington. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will give me his attention—

Mr. STAFFORD. I am giving the gentleman my attention. I heard the gentleman—

Mr. SHERLEY. The reason for these deficiency appropriations is simply to maintain existing organizations, and this particular one is not for the purpose of increasing the number of clerks that the Civil Service Commission may have. A number of departments asked for such increases. They totaled something over \$3,000,000, and the committee refused to grant them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman advise the committee whether there was an exception in the present legislative bill about allowing four persons to be employed at a rate of compensation in excess of \$1,400? If my recollection serves me right, two salaries in excess of \$1,400 were allowed, not four.

Mr. SHERLEY. The committee permitted four as seeming to be warranted in view of the enlargement of their force and their work.

Mr. STAFFORD. The reason why I made this inquiry, particularly as to the Civil Service Commission, is that in the bill reported from the legislative subcommittee we granted the Civil Service Commission a lump-sum amount, if I remember correctly, for additional clerical services, recognizing that there were additional burdens placed upon the Civil Service Commission in providing examinations for the large corps of clerks that would be employed in the department service here.

Mr. GORDON. Is it the understanding of the Committee on Appropriations that under the Overman Act the executive departments of the Government are authorized, or, rather, the President is authorized, to transfer employees from one department in which they have nothing to do to another department of the Government? Is that comprehended in the Overman Act in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I may say that that is a new suggestion to me, but prior to the promulgation of the Executive proclamation forbidding the transfers of clerks from one department to another, without the express sanction of the heads of the departments concerned, they were privileged on their own initiative to make such a transfer upon the request of another department, but an abuse arose that required the Executive proclamation, because departments were vying with each other and bidding for the services of superior clerks, and the President, I believe, last December, issued a proclamation that forbade that practice.

But under the Overman law, as I recall it, the President would have authority to transfer clerks. Certainly for a long time the department heads have been authorized to detail clerks from one bureau to another. We have had instances of that called to our attention from time to time, where clerks in the Pension Bureau have been detailed to the office of the Secretary. In the consideration of the legislative bill many instances have been called to our attention where clerks were detailed from one bureau to another, permanently, for a year or more, to perform work in bureaus where their services were urgently needed.

I think under the scope of the Overman Act the President would have that authority. If he has authority to rearrange the bureaus and consolidate them—

Mr. GORDON. And transfer functions.

Mr. STAFFORD. And transfer functions, as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, he would certainly have the power to transfer an incident of those functions, namely, the clerks to perform the work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Referring to the suggestion of the gentleman with reference to this particular appropriation for the Civil Service Commission, the gentleman will doubtless recall that when the Civil Service Commission appeared before the legislative subcommittee asking a lump-sum appropriation for additional clerks their estimate, if I mistake not, was for \$300,000. The legislative subcommittee denied that estimate and gave them \$150,000, for the reason that it was impossible at that time to determine just how many clerks they might possibly need to take care of this additional work, and with the idea at the time that if the Civil Service Commission found it necessary to have a larger appropriation they could come back and ask for a deficiency. Now, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has stated, this particular appropriation, as I understand it, does not involve the employment of a single clerk in addition to those now employed in the Civil Service Commission. As I understand it, the Civil Service Commission will have exhausted the \$150,000 by January 1, and this appropriation is simply made to enable that commission to carry on its work for the balance of the fiscal year. The gentleman knows that the Civil Service Commission has had an enormous amount of work thrust upon it by reason of the thousands and thousands of employees who have been

made necessary on account of the war, which has increased the examinations by many, many thousands.

Mr. STAFFORD. I quite agree with the statement of the chairman of the legislative subcommittee [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee], but I can not agree with the logic or approve of the position as stated by him when he approved of the action of the Civil Service Commission in allotting for the period of six months the \$150,000 which we allowed them for the entire year, and that that should be a warrant for them to come to Congress for a deficiency appropriation. I certainly must object to that course because there is a legislative mandate, a statutory law that forbids any department or bureau from allotting for any period less than a year the total appropriation that has been authorized for the entire year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will recall that prior to July 1, the Civil Service Commission had employed a large force out of an allotment of funds made to the commission by the President. Now, I do not understand that the Civil Service Commission have employed any additional clerks, but they have been carrying on the force that they had prior to July 1 in order to take care of this enormously increased work, and this appropriation is merely to enable them to continue that work. Otherwise I suggest to the gentleman that the Civil Service Commission, in which he so earnestly believes and for which he stands, would become inoperative, because it will be necessary to fill these various places outside of the civil service if we do not furnish the machinery for the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask the gentleman a question? Our committee was, as I considered, quite liberal in voting clerks to the Civil Service Commission. The president of the commission came before our subcommittee and stated that they had received an allotment from the President's emergency fund. Our subcommittee declined to reimburse them for the money so used. Now, when our subcommittee voted the Civil Service Commission \$150,000 for clerical service, was it not with the intention of providing for the clerical force over the 12-months' period.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of course, the legislative bill undertook to provide an appropriation for the entire fiscal year; but, I repeat, the gentleman will recall that they asked double the amount that the committee allowed them. The committee, in other words, reduced their estimate to \$150,000, hoping that they would be able to get along with that sum, and for the reason that no one could tell at that time as to whether or not the present conditions would continue to prevail throughout the year. Now, the committee, as I say, reduced the estimates which the commission then thought they would need for this fiscal year, and they find now that they do need the full sum that was asked, and this appropriation is simply made to enable them to carry on their present work and not to increase their force.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly do not wish to deprive the Civil Service Commission of any clerical force that is necessary to carry on their work. Our subcommittee was reminded of the necessity of increasing their force temporarily to meet the exigent conditions occasioned by the war, in examining the papers of the thousands upon thousands of clerks who are needed during the war period. I merely rose to obtain some information from the chairman of the committee, so that I could have that information when preparing the next legislative bill. I withdraw the proforma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The increases in statutory salaries, contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, shall be allowed and paid from July 1, 1918, if the employees otherwise are entitled to receive them: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not be applicable to any employee who left the service prior to September 1, 1918.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph. I do not recall any prior bill, where an appropriation bill carrying salaries has failed to be enacted before the close of the fiscal year, which has contained subsequent authorization carrying back the increased salaries to the beginning of the fiscal year. I may be in error in my recollection, but I would like to have some explanation of this exceptional practice of granting increased salaries for a period of three months when they were not voted by Congress.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit an interruption, this matter was not at issue between the two Houses. The gentleman will recall that the District of Columbia appropriation bill was held up on three items. Both Houses agreed to these increases, notably in the police force. They were losing the policemen with great rapidity, and we granted them an increase—not a radical increase, but one which would hold members of the board. Under a promise or agreement, both

Houses having agreed that the salaries should be the figures named in the bill, they were able to keep the employees. Now, we are carrying out in good faith the promise which was really made to the employees who were thereby held. But for that increase at that time we would have lost a great number of the best employees in the District of Columbia. I gave assurance to the District Commissioners that in my opinion both Houses of Congress would be very glad to put into effect what was their will expressed in the bill, which ought to have become a law before the 1st of July. The difference between the two Houses on the matter, to wit, the half-and-half plan, the McKellar item, and another small item, were the only items in difference. Therefore, feeling that the House had committed itself to that, I told the commissioners that they were warranted in saying that the very day the bill became a law they would get their salaries fixed in the bill and Congress would without hesitation give them up from the first of the fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman was assuming quite a responsibility.

Mr. Sisson. I know I did.

Mr. STAFFORD. The House has great confidence in the ability of the gentleman, and knows his acquaintance with the needs of the District, especially since he has been charged with the responsibility of reporting the appropriations necessary for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Sisson. Let me say to the gentleman that I did not do it without the absolute sanction of both Houses of Congress, in that they had agreed to the bill in all the other items except the three items I have mentioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not recall that the Congress had ever sanctioned any private understanding of the gentleman.

Mr. Sisson. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know that any such statement was ever made on the floor of the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. There was no private understanding, there was an actual concrete situation that confronted the District of Columbia. They had to hold their forces, and that was one of the reasons why Congress passed the increased salary in order to hold many employees. That particularly pertained to some employees—I think the police and other employees. The Congress agreed to the increase, and the bill, as the gentleman recalls, was held up by a fight over the half-and-half principle. In the meanwhile the Commissioners of the District of Columbia were confronted with the fact that their employees would not remain at the old salary and they were held under the statement that the bill carried an increase and as soon as it passed they would receive the increase as of the 1st of July. There was a general acquiescence on the part of everybody as to that situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman means by "everybody"—whom? Does the gentleman include others than the subcommittee that had charge of the bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. The situation was known in the House generally, and for my part I am perfectly willing to assume my part of the responsibility.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will accept the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi that there was such an understanding had with the District Commissioners, but I think it would have been better form to have provided in the resolution continuing the appropriations of the last appropriation bill an item that the salaries carried in the pending bill should be continued during the next fiscal year, as we did some years ago in continuing the appropriations of the Post Office appropriation bill, by providing an increase of salary for the rural mail carriers when that bill failed of passage. I called attention to this matter because I think it is exceptional practice to go back and vote salaries as of the first of the year. I was not acquainted with the fact that there was any private understanding—

Mr. SHERLEY. It was not a private understanding; there is no private understanding ever made by me as chairman of the Appropriations Committee with any department of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has there been any statement on the floor of the House in relation to this understanding? If so, I do not recall it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not positive of that fact, but it was understood as a matter of general knowledge.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am pretty well versed in the affairs which go on, and if it had been stated on the floor of the House I would not have arisen and called attention to the matter.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am willing to exempt the gentleman from any understanding of it—he may not have understood so—but I repeat that it was a matter of general understanding. I am quite sure that there was some newspaper comment in connection

tion with it. It was simply the practical way of dealing with a concrete situation that had arisen; and if there had been no understanding, I still think it ought to be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am rising to make an inquiry as to the situation in good faith.

Mr. SHERLEY. And I am not objecting to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. STAFFORD. I had no knowledge of any understanding, private or otherwise, never heard of it in the Committee on Appropriations or on the floor, in connection with the various resolutions which have been presented by the gentleman from Mississippi extending the effect of the last District appropriation bill by reason of the snarl that the committee got into with reference to three items. If there had been any mention of it on the floor of the House, there would have been no necessity for my taking the floor.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not objecting to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to say that, if there was any such understanding, I think it would have been better to have had some reference made to it on the floor of the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps that is true; but if there was none made it was because of the belief that the situation was well understood.

Mr. STAFFORD. The District bill was under consideration several times, and no mention was made that the increase of salaries was going to be carried into effect as of the first of the year.

Mr. Sisson. Let me say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Davis], the ranking Republican member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McAndrews], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gallivan], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], all understood that we were going to ask that salaries should take effect from the 1st of July.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that when he presented the various resolutions, extending the appropriations of the prior fiscal year, he should have made some reference in the House to the fact that that was to be the policy?

Mr. Sisson. I want to state to the gentleman that there was a very good reason in our minds why we did not do that. We thought we would get a better opportunity to get an agreement out of the Senate on the disagreeing items by not agreeing to this and letting pressure be brought upon the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's expectation failed upon that.

Mr. Sisson. It did not fail altogether.

Mr. STAFFORD. Upon the main item of the half-and-half principle, in which I was in entire sympathy with the gentleman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Treadway. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking that the telegram which I send to the desk be read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
Washington, D. C.:

Please inform President Wilson that Deane Works, of Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation, after going the limit and subscribing 100 per cent strong for \$175,000, an average of \$135 per employee, have enrolled an unconditional-surrender club of 71 members, each subscribing for one more bond. Above figures show how we feel about backing the boys to a victorious finish.

CHARLES L. NEWCOMB,
Manager Deane Works, Holyoke, Mass.

The Clerk read as follows:

1. The emergency shipping fund provision of the urgent deficiency appropriation act of June 15, 1917, as amended by the act of April 22, 1918 (Public Act, No. 138 of the 65th Cong.), is hereby amended, as follows.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry, with the reservation of a point of order. The inquiry goes to the paragraphs, the first one of which has been read. Will we consider the item by paragraphs or by Titles I and II? We have just read lines 13 to 16 on page 3. Will that be considered a paragraph under the rule applying to appropriation bills? If so, I rise to make inquiries as to the purpose of this change in the law.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that as a matter of convenience each of the divisions can be considered separately. I shall undertake to explain the purpose of them, if the gentleman will permit the reading down to line 22, which will embrace the first paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should be very glad to do that, subject, of course, to the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that each subdivision should be considered as a separate paragraph, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(1) In subdivision (d) of paragraph 1, to begin said subdivision and to precede the words "to requisition," are now inserted the words: "To acquire, construct, establish, or extend any plant, and in pursuance thereof to purchase, requisition, or otherwise acquire title to or use of land, improved or unimproved, or interests therein; and".

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the two paragraphs which have just been read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen withhold that for a moment so that I may be permitted to obtain some information in respect to this particular subdivision?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to inquire wherein this increases the power of the Shipping Board?

Mr. SHERLEY. The language of the act creating the President's emergency shipping fund, in the opinion of the lawyers of the Shipping Board, seemed perhaps to be deficient in the power for the establishment of a plant and to be deficient in the power "to acquire title to the use of land improved or unimproved or interest therein," and inasmuch as we have been establishing plants, and inasmuch as we have been and it was desirable to acquire land, both improved and unimproved, it was felt that any legal question as to the power of the agents designated by the President under the act should be removed by this extension of language.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There has been some doubt, then, as to the legality of their acquiring certain ground?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is a question as to whether any power existed for the acquiring of unimproved land or improved land that was not taken over directly as a shipbuilding plant. Personally, I have felt that the language which is in the existing law was broader than the doubt touching it seemed to imply, but it is a matter about which there ought not to be any doubt. For that reason, upon the representation of Mr. Whipple and Mr. Wehle, attorneys for the Shipping Board, this amendment is submitted to the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My recollection is that the powers heretofore conferred were very comprehensive.

Mr. SHERLEY. They were. As to paragraph (d) the act now reads as follows:

To requisition and take over for use or operation by the United States any plant or any part thereof without taking possession of the entire plant, whether the United States has or has not any contract or agreement with the owner or occupier of such plant.

Subsequently there was legislation increasing the appropriation to the President, and in making that appropriation language was used that clearly indicates to my mind the intention of Congress that the President, through such agencies as he might employ, should have the power to establish plants; so that I think that the only question that is really involved in the way of the extension of power is the question of making clear the power to acquire title or use of land improved or unimproved. Then there was some question which the lawyers raised as to whether taking over for use or occupation by the United States meant taking over simply for use and occupation or taking over the title. In some instances they have needed to do one, and in some instances they have needed to do the other. They simply wanted to make clear the power beyond peradventure of acquiring these plants and establishing plants and extending them and acquiring land in connection with them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman satisfied in view of these increased or stronger powers, a tightening up of the situation, that owners of property and property rights are adequately protected in the matter of compensation?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is provision in the law as originally drawn, and it was afterwards unnecessarily reput in as an amendment to the law that was reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which carries the well-known provision about the fixing of a price, and if it be not agreeable to the owner of the property, the payment of 75 per cent of the price, leaving the owner to sue in the court for what additional sum he thought necessary.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All those safeguards are maintained?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably. There is no intention in any way, of course, to take property without making provision for compensation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know whether the gentleman's especial attention has been called to the form of amendment adopted here, which follows in subsequent sections, but it is

rather new in amendatory language. Lines 17 to 19, page 3, read as follows:

(I) In subdivision (d) of paragraph 1, to begin said subdivision and to precede the words "to requisition," are now inserted the words—

And so forth.

That is rather novel. May I inquire who prepared this?

Mr. SHERLEY. It was prepared by the attorneys of the Shipping Board. I undertook to rephrase it, and to set out just the way the whole paragraph would read, but it meant to carry into the bill a page or two of language, and I felt that it would be clearer to the House if they understood just what language was being inserted, and then have such explanation made as might be desirable. I had printed just for my own information a sheet here that undertook to show the way this law will read as amended, and I will be glad if the gentleman is not clear about any paragraph to explain it. For instance, I will state now for the RECORD that this paragraph which is now proposed to be amended if amended in this form would read as follows:

To acquire, construct, establish, or extend any plant and any appurtenances thereof, to purchase, requisition, or otherwise acquire title to or use of land improved or unimproved or interest therein, and to requisition and take over for use or operation by the United States any plant or any part thereof without taking possession of the entire plant, whether the United States has or has not any contract or agreement with the owner or occupier of such plant.

Mr. STAFFORD. I quite agree with the construction placed by the learned attorney and chairman of the committee that it was hardly necessary to amplify the existing language, but of course we wish to make certain the powers to be conferred on this board, and if the attorneys for the board have any question, of course, perhaps, it would be better to amplify it in plainer language.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will appreciate that we have appropriated something like \$4,000,000,000 to the President to be expended in the creation of a merchant marine. Now, with such huge sums involved and with very large expenditures running into the millions of dollars, I did not feel like I ought to leave any question as to these necessary powers, even though my own judgment might be that the language heretofore used was sufficient. We do not want unnecessary lawsuits. We are going to have enough as a result of the war without unnecessarily having them if we can clarify and make plain what is intended by everybody.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LINTHICUM having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) to establish a reserve of the Public Health Service, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. OWEN, and Mr. TOWNSEND conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

(II) In subdivision (f) of said paragraph 1, after the words "or assume control of," are now inserted the words "or to extend, improve, or increase, or cause to be extended, improved, or increased."

Mr. SHERLEY. The purpose of that is this: It is to make valid beyond any question what has been the practice of the Shipping Board for some time past in connection with the problem of housing incident to these shipping plants. It has been found that relief could be had frequently by improving the transportation to the plant from homes where the workmen were, and that by increasing street railway and steam railway facilities the necessity for building additional houses was eliminated. Now, that improvement can take place, and it has usually taken place, by extensions of existing facilities—where the track is a single track frequently the doubling of it, putting in switches and increasing the number of cars and the schedules by which many men can be accommodated at points some distance from the plant who otherwise could not be accommodated—and if it were not done the Government would be called upon either to get along with less labor or else greatly increase the houses for the workers at these plants.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is nothing in the report about this subdivision, and that is the reason I asked the gentleman whether this subdivision (f) pertained only to transportation.

Mr. SHERLEY. Subdivision (f) reads as follows without the amendment. (f) was an amendment that was placed on the original act by a special bill reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Relating to transportation? Mr. SHERLEY. I am going to read it:

(f) To take possession of, lease, or assume control of any street railway, interurban railroad, or part thereof wherever operated, and all cars, appurtenances, and franchises or parts thereof commonly used in connection with the operation thereof necessary for the transfer and transportation of employees of shipyards or plants engaged or that may hereafter be engaged in the construction of ships or equipment therefor for the United States.

Now, that is the existing law. That as amended would read as follows:

To take possession of, lease, or assume control of.

Now comes the new language:

Or to extend, improve, or increase or cause to be extended, improved, or increased.

And then follows the language of the existing law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would mean if it was found necessary in order to move these workmen expeditiously, to extend a road or put in a siding or make certain additions or increase of the service, the board would have power to do it?

Mr. SHERLEY. It means that, and, further, they have been doing just that thing. In order that there might be no question whether the language, "to take possession of, lease, or assume control of," permitted the right of extension of, they have asked this amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is another case of having the law made plain?

Mr. SHERLEY. Made perfectly clear that the powers they have been exercising and that are necessary to be exercised shall be warranted by the letter of the law.

Mr. ANDERSON. The literal interpretation of this language would seem to give the Shipping Board the power to extend the franchise. Of course, that is not intended?

Mr. SHERLEY. The language as it fits into the existing law would not make that possible. I will read the whole language—

Mr. ANDERSON. I have it here.

Mr. SHERLEY. The way it will read now is this:

(f) To take possession of, lease, or assume control of or extend, improve, or increase, or cause to be extended, improved, or increased, any street railroad, interurban railroad, or part thereof wherever operated, and all cars, appurtenances, and franchises or parts thereof commonly used in connection with the operation thereof—

And so forth.

Now, the word "franchise" there applies to the case of taking possession of and using powers under existing franchises. Manifestly, Congress could not confer upon this or any other body the right to extend franchises of street railways within the States, and, in point of fact, there is no intention so to do. And this language could not be used to confer such a power. I am glad the gentleman speaks of the matter, in order that there may be this expression on the floor of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it ought to be perfectly clear.

Mr. SHERLEY. No such practice is being undertaken. In point of fact, they are not taking over the street railways at all. What they are doing is to help finance extensions and improvements in order to get the additional transportation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this amendment which the committee seeks to report mainly intended to authorize the Shipping Board to equip the existing street railways with additional facilities, rolling stock, and the like, so as to make them more serviceable in the transportation of men from the plants to their homes and from their homes to the plants?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; and sometimes the situation is brought about by the building of a switch and additional trackage, so as not to have cars delayed in passing.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not believe that there is any authority in the Shipping Board at present to further increase their facilities in the purchase of cars, unless it was granted under the authority for the Shipping Board to finance these interurban corporations.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, the gentleman will find there is a subsequent amendment looking to taking care of advances and loans in order to accomplish these purposes. In other words, instead of compelling the Government to build them or take them over and requisition them, what they have done—which is much more economical and satisfactory—is to loan the money or to finance things that they approve as necessary in order to increase their facilities.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have thought that instances would arise where they would be compelled to increase the rolling stock to such an extent to meet the exigent conditions of war time, and which would not be existent during peace times. I have in mind conditions in the great industrial territory south of Philadelphia. There is no question but what additional rolling

stock, more than necessary in peace times, is required in these abnormal war times, and I think this provision is partly for the purpose of authorizing the Shipping Board to provide additional rolling stock.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true, except the way they have been providing, it has been to make loans to these corporations with the idea of enabling them thereby to improve their transportation systems.

The Clerk read as follows:

(III) After said subdivision (f) in said paragraph 1, a new subdivision is now inserted as follows:

"(g) In pursuance of the foregoing powers, or any of them, to make advance payments or loans of such amounts and upon such terms as the President may deem necessary and proper."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is what I alluded to a moment ago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Pardon me a moment, if the gentleman pleases, but does this pertain to the same matter as the last subdivision?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; it not only pertains to that, but it pertains to all the powers that have been given to the President in connection with the expenditure of the shipping fund. And it provides they can obtain extensions to plants or in the way of railway systems or other facilities, by making loans as against the Government making the actual expenditures. Now, the result of that is very greatly to reduce the amount of moneys that the Government has to spend, and these loans are made upon securities sufficient to guarantee their repayment. They already have, under express provision, authority in regard to housing.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does this provision legalize the right to concur in many of these contracts in which loans are made or advances are made?

Mr. SHERLEY. It would legalize this: If the President saw fit to permit moneys to be loaned with provision for only their partial payment, this would authorize it. But it is not my understanding that any such practice is being indulged in by the Shipping Board in connection with these extensions. But that is simply my impression, and I would not like to state it as a fact.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is being done by several other bureaus of the Government.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not only is, but ought to be, and must be if you get things done. It is perfectly patent you can not get men to-day to undertake extensions of any plants at their own expense, with the superwar cost and with the risk of no continuing need after the war, unless the Government undertakes to bear part of the burden.

Mr. ANDERSON. I quite agree with the gentleman; but it does seem to me that a provision of this kind ought to be safeguarded a good deal more than I think this will be. It ought to come from the committee to whom legislation of this character ought to be referred.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I will be delighted beyond expression if all the various legislative committees of the House will take care of all the matters that are brought to the Committee on Appropriations. I send them there repeatedly, and that is the end of them. Now, when matters of real emergency for the prosecution of the war are necessary the committee must act, and, in point of fact, this power originated in the Committee on Appropriations.

The power under which they are spending this money was power which was carried in a deficiency act passed in June, 1917, and it had nothing to do with the shipping act, which came from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Personally I have no interest in the matter except to serve the Government, and if the gentleman thinks it ought to be delayed by going through the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I shall not object.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think the gentleman should take that attitude. He ought to be here to give information, and be willing to give it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have given it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think he ought to criticize people who are asking for information.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not. I am simply saying we are carrying it in this bill because of the circumstances. I tried to explain just what is involved. Now, the gentleman thinks it is not sufficiently circumscribed, and that it ought to be sent to another committee. If the House sees fit to do that, all right. I am not seeking to take power to the Committee on Appropriations in legislative matters.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(IV) In paragraph 8 of said provisions, after the word "shipyard" are now inserted the words "dry-dock, marine railway, pier." In said paragraph the words "or other facilities connected therewith" are stricken out and there are now inserted, after the word "terminal," the following words: "and any facilities or improvements connected with any of the foregoing descriptions of property."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that for the purpose of getting information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this was again an opinion of the lawyers, which I did not share, but which they urged with a good deal of insistence. The language now reads, in connection with the word "plant," as follows:

The word "plant" shall include any factory, workshop, warehouse, engine works, buildings used for manufacture, assembling, construction, or any process in shipyard, dry dock, marine railway, pier, or dockyard and discharging terminal, or other facilities connected therewith.

Now, the lawyers made two criticisms of that. One was that they had a question as to whether the word "shipyard" or "dockyard" embraced such things as dry dock, marine railway, or pier. To my mind they clearly do. The act, I think, was wisely drawn in generic terms, but they wanted to be sure, inasmuch as they are building dry docks and marine railways and piers, so that they made the insertion of the words after the word "shipyard."

Then, they had some question as to whether the words "other facilities connected therewith" qualified simply the language "discharging terminal" or whether they related to the shipyards or dockyards, and, not wanting to have any question about that, they suggested the striking out of the words "or other facilities connected therewith" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "or other facilities or improvements connected with any of the foregoing descriptions of property." The purpose of the amendment was to clarify the existing statute. I again say that in my judgment the amendment was not necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think it does clarify it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I worked over it with these distinguished lawyers, and they seemed to think it made more clear the situation.

Mr. MADDEN. My thought was that it made it more complex, because it seems to me you eliminate the facilities that are connected with the dry dock or the railway or the pier or the terminal; and, eliminating that, of course you do not in my judgment include the facilities to which the term applied.

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps if I read the language as amended it would help to clarify it. The language would read as follows:

The word "plant" shall include any factory, workshop, warehouse, engine works, buildings used for manufacture, assembling or construction or any process in shipyard, dry dock, marine railway, pier, or dockyard and discharging terminal, or any facilities or improvements connected with any of the foregoing descriptions of property.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that covers the thing, and I suppose it would be considered that "other facilities connected therewith" would be surplusage.

Mr. SHERLEY. They thought that the words "other facilities connected therewith" now qualified simply a discharging terminal. What they wanted to do was to embrace facilities that pertain to shipyards or dry docks or dockyards or piers, or any of these other matters—

Mr. MADDEN. Or railroads—

Mr. SHERLEY. Or railroads; and for that reason they asked for the enlargement of power.

Mr. MADDEN. It ought to be. I thought at first it was rather restrictive, but after the reading of the language by the gentleman I think that covers it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have read that the Shipping Board proposes to build certain dry docks. There is no doubt that they have started work on some piers. They have built piers. They have built marine railways. Does the gentleman know whether dry-dock work has actually been started in any instance?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it has. The gentleman will note that immediately following this in the next section is a provision authorizing the acquisition or establishment of plants such as marine railways, dry docks, and so forth, to the extent of \$34,662,500, and the hearings state very fully the places, the amounts, and what is contemplated to be done. On page 1335 of the hearings the gentleman will find a statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is the page, please?

Mr. SHERLEY. Page 1335.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, as a matter of fact, the board has been going ahead, doing work on dry docks, marine railways, and piers.

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Which will now be included in the law, so that there will be no question as to their authority to do this work?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true. The gentleman will find lists set out as to executed dry-dock contracts, covering three pages.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The purpose, then, is not only to facilitate the work but to leave no question about the authority of the board to do it?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is to make it perfectly plain that the powers they are exercising were powers that were conferred.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And warranted by law?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I think possibly this matter has been brought to the gentleman's attention, but I wanted to ask him with reference to the unusual phraseology of these amendments. It seemed to me that it would be better if these amendments might be made in the manner in which it has been the custom to amend existing legislation. It says the words are stricken out and they are now inserted, and so forth.

Mr. SHERLEY. I explained a few moments ago—

Mr. WALSH. I am sorry I was not here.

Mr. SHERLEY. I undertook to present it so that the law would appear as it is proposed to be amended; but in order to do that it would have been necessary to print a couple of pages of the old law as revised, and I thought that the changes were sufficiently plain so that I could indicate, as I have endeavored to, just what the meaning was. In each instance I have undertaken to set out in the Record exactly the way the law would read as amended. I have here a print giving the law as it would be as amended.

Mr. WALSH. I came in just as the gentleman was reading that, and I did not know what question brought out his response. But may I direct the gentleman's attention to this? In line 10, page 4, if you strike out the words "are now inserted" and insert in place thereof the word "insert," so that it will read—

In paragraph 8 of said provisions, after the word "shipyards," insert the words "dry-dock, marine railway, pier"—

That would make it perfectly clear. The point I make is that I am afraid to use the phraseology "are now inserted" might lead to some doubt in case of interpretation of the legislation by the courts. I just wanted to get the gentleman's idea.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think there would be any question about it. If you do that, you have got to rearrange the para-

graph. For instance, following that you will come to the language:

In said paragraph the words "or other facilities connected therewith" are stricken out and there are now inserted, after the word "terminal," the following words: "and any facilities or improvements connected with any of the foregoing descriptions of property."

You would have to rearrange it so that it would read:

In said paragraph strike out the words "or other facilities connected therewith" and insert, after the word "terminal," the words "and any facilities or improvements connected with any of the foregoing descriptions of property."

Mr. WALSH. I know the gentleman has given careful consideration to the matter, and I just wanted to be sure that it would not lead to any doubt as to the meaning of the language.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not; and in order to safeguard it I have read into the Record the way the provision that is being amended will read as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I withdraw it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, answering a question a few minutes ago, called attention to a list of dry-dock contracts to be found on page 1337 of the hearings. As it is not likely that these hearings will be read outside of Congress, I think it is rather important to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief summary of the contracts as they are set forth in this statement. Mr. Piez, of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, was on the stand, and in response to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], he put in the following data as to executed dry-dock contracts. I shall read only the names of the companies, the location of the dock, and the estimated cost of the dock. That will be sufficient information for the present.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that the gentleman simply put into the Record the entire table not only as to dry docks but the one that follows, as to marine railway contracts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to do that. I ask permission to have that done, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting the table referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Data as to executed dry-dock contracts.

No. of contracts.	Name of company and location of dock.	Work to be done.	Estimated cost.	Investment of contractor.	Amount of loan.	Final payment when due.	Security.		Write off.
							Bond and mortgage.	Other security.	
1	Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.	Wooden floating dock of 10,000 tons.	\$500,000	Contractor furnishes site.	Actual cost.....	4 years after maturity date.	Bond of company and first mortgage on dry dock and on substantial portion of adjacent site.	Docking charges against vessels owned by the United States credited upon payment of loan.	Absolute write off of from 33 1/2 to 38 1/2 per cent, according to when maturity date occurs.
2	(Superseded by contract No. 6.)								
3	Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.), Sparrows Point, Md.	Completion of 20,000-ton floating dock steel wings, wooden pontoons.	2,300,000	Site and cost in excess of sums loaned.	Cost up to \$1,250,000.	Note.—This loan repayable in five equal annual installments, commencing Dec. 31, 1918.	Bond of company and first mortgage on floating dry dock.	Guaranty of Bethlehem Steel Corporation.	None.
4	Beaumont Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Beaumont, Tex.	Wooden floating dock capacity, 8,000 tons.	450,000	Contractor furnishes site and cost in excess of amount loaned.	75 per cent of cost up to but not exceeding \$350,000.	4 years after maturity date.	Bond of company and first mortgage on floating dry dock and site.	Docking charges against vessels owned by the United States credited upon payment of loan.	Absolute write off of 25 1/2 to 33 1/2 per cent, depending upon date of final payment.
5	Galveston Dry Dock & Construction Co., Galveston, Tex.	Wood and steel floating dock, 10,000 tons.	761,319	Site furnished by contractor and cost in excess of amount loaned.	80 per cent of cost not to exceed \$975,000.do.....	Bond of company and first mortgage on lease hold interest and on dry-dock building and improvements.do.....	Absolute write off of 40 per cent.
6	(Superseded by contracts Nos. 8 and 9.)								
7	Jahnecke Shipbuilding Co. (Inc.), New Orleans, La.	Wood and steel floating dock, 10,000 tons.	770,000	Repair plant, site, and cost in excess of loan.	Cost up to \$700,000.	5 years after maturity date.	Bond of borrower and first mortgage on site, on dry dock, and on repair plant.	75 per cent net earnings of dry dock and repair plant applied against payment of loan.	Contingent allowance not to exceed 30 per cent cost floating portion dry dock nor in any event \$210,000.

Data as to executed dry-dock contracts—Continued.

No. of contracts.	Name of company and location of dock.	Work to be done.	Estimated cost.	Investment of contractor.	Amount of loan.	Final payment when due.	Security.		Write off.
							Bond and mortgage.	Other security.	
8	Terry & Brittain, Jacksonville, Fla.	Construction of dry dock 6,000 tons, marine railway 2,500 tons, and repair plant.	\$775,000	Site and cost in excess of amount loaned.	Cost not exceeding \$672,000.	10 years after maturity date.	Bond executed by both Terry & Brittain first mortgage upon dry dock, repair plant, and leasehold.	50 per cent of net earnings of dry dock, marine railway, and repair plant.	Contingent allowance not to exceed 30 per cent cost floating portion dry dock not exceeding \$123,000.
9	Terry & Brittain, Savannah, Ga.	Wooden floating dry dock 8,000 tons and repair plant.	589,000	Contractor furnished site and cost in excess of amount loaned.	Cost not exceeding \$577,000.do.....	Bond executed by both Terry & Brittain mortgage on dry dock, repair plant, and site.	50 per cent of net earnings of dry dock and repair plant applied to repayment of loan.	Absolute allowance of 40 per cent of cost of floating portion of dock not exceeding \$209,000.

Data as to executed marine railway contracts.

No. of contract.	Name of company and location of railway.	Work to be done.	Investment of contractor.	Amount of loan.	Final payment when due.	Security.	
						Bond and mortgage.	Other security.
1	Henderson Shipbuilding Co. (Inc.), Mobile, Ala.	2,500-ton wooden marine railway.	Contractor furnishes site and steam power and defrays cost in excess of amount loaned.	Cost up to \$100,000.	3 years after maturity date.	Bond of company and first mortgage on railway and site.	Docking charges against vessels owned by United States may be credited on repayment of loan.
2	Newcomb Lifeboat Co., Hampton, Va.	2,500-ton marine railway.	Contractor defrays cost in excess of amount loaned, and furnishes all necessary lumber and piling.do.....	2 years after maturity date.	Bond of contractor and first mortgage upon railway and site.	Do.
3	Crownshield Shipbuilding Co., Somerset, Mass.do.....	Contractor furnishes site and defrays cost of excavating and dredging and cost in excess of amount loaned.do.....	3 years after maturity date. (Note.—\$10,000 is to be paid 6 months after completion of dock.) No money loaned.	Note of contractor and first mortgage upon railway and substantial part of contractor's plant.	Do.
4	Beaumont Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Beaumont, Tex.do.....do.....do.....do.....do.....do.....
5	Cumberland Shipbuilding Co., Portland, Me.do.....	Contractor furnishes site and defrays cost in excess of amount loaned and cost of dredging and grading.do.....	5 years after maturity date.	Bond of contractor and first mortgage on railway site and substantial portion of contractor's plant.	Do.
6	Tampa Dock Co., Tampa, Fla.do.....	Contractor furnishes site and agrees to build a machine shop at its own expense and bears at its own expense cost of dredging and piling and any other cost in excess of amount loaned.do.....	3 years after maturity date.	Bond of contractor and first mortgage upon railway, machine shop, and site.do.....
7	Federal Marine Ry. Co., Savannah, Ga.do.....	Contractor furnishes site, complete siding, and defrays cost in excess of amount loaned.do.....do.....	Bond of company secured by first mortgage on railway, site, and substantial portions of adjacent land.	Guarantee of R. S. Salas; also docking charges against vessels owned by United States may be credited upon repayment of loan.
8	Terry & Brittain, Jacksonville, Fla.do.....	(See dry-dock contract No. 8.)do.....do.....do.....do.....
9, 1	Barnes & Tibbetts Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Alameda, Cal.	Complete one 4,000-ton railway; construct one 2,500-ton railway.	Contractor furnishes site and defrays cost in excess of the moneys loaned by the Fleet Corporation; amount invested by contractor exclusive of site to be not less than \$25,000.	Cost up to \$110,000.	3 years after maturity date.	Bond of contractor and mortgage on shipyard and railway subject only to prior mortgage of \$35,000; equity of contractor, not including new construction work, estimated to be at least \$300,000.	50 per cent of net earnings of railway and repair plant.
1	None.....do.....do.....do.....do.....do.....do.....
12	American Dredging Co., Camden, N. J.	2,000-ton marine railway.do.....do.....	No money loaned.do.....do.....

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Meanwhile, and not necessarily because the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] made a political speech a while ago in which he referred to "the millions and millions" that "somebody" was pouring into certain political campaigns but because I think it would be interesting information to him as a student of these financial questions, I shall read off hurriedly this list of Government contracts that have been going into certain sections of the country. While they are not in the nature of slush funds, of course, and are only for patriotic purposes, they are highly important locally.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the gentleman propose to read a lesson of instruction to the gentleman from Alabama? Is it something that the gentleman is going to give out himself?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I was going to put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I thought it might be highly

beneficial to the gentleman in his study of these political and financial questions.

Contract No. 1, Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala., estimated cost \$560,000.

Contract No. 2 (superseded by contract No. 6).

Contract No. 3, Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.), Sparrows Point, Md., estimated cost \$2,300,000.

Contract No. 4, Beaumont Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Beaumont, Tex., estimated cost \$450,000.

Contract No. 5, Galveston Dry Dock & Construction Co., Galveston, Tex., estimated cost \$761,319.

Contract No. 6 (superseded by contracts Nos. 8 and 9).

Contract No. 7, Jahncke Shipbuilding Co. (Inc.), New Orleans, La., estimated cost \$770,000.

Contract No. 8, Terry & Brittain, Jacksonville, Fla., estimated cost \$775,000.

Contract No. 9, Terry & Brittain, Savannah, Ga., estimated cost \$559,000.

Now, as to the marine railway contracts, perhaps I ought to put them in just here.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will ask the gentleman if he does not know that more money is expended in his district for war purposes than all the items that he has read for these southern States?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I do not know that, and I question very much if that is the fact.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will furnish the information to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman, in his study of financial subjects, will put these figures in the RECORD, I will circulate them in my district, because it would be very interesting to the people there to know it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will give the gentleman the statistics for all the States in a few days, which will show that ten, fifteen, and twenty times more money is being spent in each northern State than in any southern State, and more in the gentleman's own State than in all the southern States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would be very complimentary to "the gentleman from Pennsylvania," but I question whether the compliment the gentleman from Alabama pays to "the gentleman from Pennsylvania" is well bestowed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But it is complimentary to the gentleman from Alabama to have it known that while he makes beautiful speeches here reflecting on the Republican Party and charging enormous slush funds, and things of that kind, from the days of Ballinger down, the gentleman himself has had his hands in the trough and yanked a few contracts down to Alabama. It is one of those peculiar political phenomena worth considering when the gentleman gets on his feet and makes speeches in defense of the administration. I hope the gentleman will listen, because this is interesting to him, and it ought to be interesting to his people. It is sort of an answer to the charges the gentleman has made:

Henderson Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala., cost \$100,000.

Newcomb Lifeboat Co., Hampton, Va., estimated cost \$100,000.

Crowninshield Shipbuilding Co., Somerset, Mass., estimated cost \$100,000.

Beaumont Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Beaumont, Tex.

Cumberland Shipbuilding Co., Portland, Me., a similar estimate.

Tampa Dock Co., Tampa, Fla., a similar estimate.

Federal Marine Railway Co., Savannah, Ga., a similar estimate.

Terry & Brittain, Jackson, Fla., a similar estimate.

Barnes & Tibbetts Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Alameda, Cal., estimated cost \$110,000.

American Dredging Co., Camden, N. J., which is opposite the district of "the gentleman from Pennsylvania," no money loaned.

So, for the purpose of the record, it is well to have people understand that while we are all intensely patriotic, the gentleman from Alabama simply topping the climax when it comes to intensive and vociferous patriotism, the gentleman is still reaching down into the trough for the benefit of his own State and getting something out of it. Perhaps it is not well for gentlemen who live in glass houses to throw stones, but whether this advice will be followed by the gentleman from Alabama I do not know. Let him have the credit and glory of getting something for his district, now that he is in power and stands pat at the White House gate. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not care either to invoke or take part in the controversy between Members of the House, but I think we ought to keep the record straight as we go along. Now, the trouble with my genial friend from Pennsylvania is that he looked at only one table in connection with

the contracts that are executed. If he will turn to pages 1331 and 1332 of the hearings he will find a statement of the proposed contracts which totals \$34,662,500, and they are divided as follows:

Proposed construction.	
One 10,000-ton dry dock at Portland, Me.	\$2,100,000
One dry dock at Portsmouth, N. H.	900,000
(Boston, Mass.), bonus for the completion of the Commonwealth dock	250,000
Three 10,000-ton floating dry docks	6,500,000
Three 3,200-ton marine railways to be located at Providence, R. I.; Seattle, Wash.; and Astoria, Oreg.	760,000
One 10,000-ton dry dock at Fall River, New London, or Providence	2,100,000
Ten dry docks—New York Harbor, 10,000 to 20,000 ton capacities	25,000,000
Three 10,000-ton floating dry docks at Philadelphia	10,000,000
[Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]	
One 10,000-ton dry dock at Baltimore, Md.	2,100,000
One 10,000-ton floating dry dock, Norfolk Harbor	2,100,000
Financial assistance for completion of 7,500-ton dock, Charleston, S. C.	300,000
One 5,000-ton floating dry dock, Pensacola, Fla.	350,000

That makes a total of \$52,460,000, and less the available balance of \$17,797,500 leaves \$34,662,500—that is being carried in this bill.

Then as to the actual or estimated commitments for marine railways the gentleman will find a list totaling \$878,500, and they are at various places along the coast.

I want to say this seriously, aside from the pleasantries exchanged which take place from time to time on the floor, that the dry docks are being located at these places where the shipping warrants their being placed. They are not being placed either North or South because it is North or South, and no appropriation has ever been made by the Committee on Appropriations while I have been a member of the committee that have been predicated upon geographical considerations from a political sense. The committee does not consider these matters, and the departments, in spending these huge sums of money, do not consider it. It so happens that a very large proportion of the money is spent north of Mason and Dixon's line, and that follows simply because of the fact that a great portion of the commercial industrial development of the country is now north of Mason and Dixon's line, and it has not been to play politics one way or the other. I think the country ought to understand and appreciate that while we occasionally have a little fun with each other, the Congress of the United States and the departments have forgotten geographical positions in the political sense of the term. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

3. The United States Shipping Board shall not require payment from the War Department for the charter hire of vessels furnished or to be furnished from July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive, for the use of that department when such vessels are owned by the United States Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that. I would like very much to have the chairman of the committee explain why it was thought wise to forego the charge by the Shipping Board to the War Department. Of course, I realize that it all comes out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. That was the major reason. There were submitted as estimates in connection with the transportation of the Army an estimate for the pay of charter hire for all the vessels that would be used by the Army in connection with the transportation of troops and supplies. As to those vessels which the Government does not own, of course, we must repay the United States Shipping Board for the charter hire that it has to pay, but it did not seem to the committee wise in this day of tremendous appropriations to have to appropriate for the Army to pay to the Shipping Board, and it simply involved unnecessary bookkeeping and unnecessary appropriations, and as a result of that and a revision of the whole cost of charter hire there has been a reduction of about 189 million and odd dollars made in the estimates under the head of transportation of the Army.

Mr. MADDEN. I was not here yesterday when the gentleman explained the bill, and I see that his remarks are not yet printed.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will appreciate that I have not had a chance to revise my figures, and I wanted to be absolutely accurate.

Mr. MADDEN. If it is not inconsistent with the public policy to answer this, if the gentleman can tell, I would like to know what the cost per capita of this transport is where our men sail on foreign-owned ships.

Mr. SHERLEY. The charter hire, where we charter a ship, averages about \$9.20 a dead-weight ton. That includes the ship

with its crew and officers. The allied steamers chartered average about \$11 a ton, and the American steamships, which were requisitioned and which includes the naked ship without a crew and officers, is \$5.64 a dead-weight ton.

Mr. MADDEN. What does that make the individual passenger cost?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no computation on that. I doubt if it could be obtained without a pretty elaborate calculation, because many ships have a dead-weight ton capacity and a passenger-carrying capacity very much different from what another ship of the same dead-weight ton capacity would have, due somewhat to construction.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it would be interesting if these figures could be compiled, because I know there is a feeling in many quarters throughout the country that we are paying a good deal more for the transportation of our troops to the allied nations who are furnishing ships than they are justified in charging. I would not undertake to say that that is true, but there is a general feeling that it is true.

Mr. SHERLEY. This is true. The impression which existed in some quarters that we were getting ships furnished free by some of our allies for the movement of our troops or supplies is not warranted. I think there was one ship from a South American nation that was furnished to the United States Government for one or more trips free of charge, but with that exception we are paying for all of the tonnage that we use.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course we could not expect to get it free, and ought not to.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand we could not; but I simply wanted to make that statement in view of the impression that was in the minds of some that our allies were bearing the burden of transporting our troops. They have been very generous in the giving over to us ships for that use, and of course that has meant, necessarily, the curtailment of ships used in their commercial trade on routes that have been long established. It was only what was to be expected, however, from allies who were cooperating with us in using the united forces of all nations in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. MADDEN. I heard it said—whether there is any truth in it or not, and whether it is proper for me to make the statement for the Record I would not undertake to say; and if it is not true I would not want it to go into the Record—that the charge made by Great Britain for the transportation of our soldiers averages \$150 per man for carrying them across. I do not know a thing about the truth of that, but those who told me claimed they have knowledge of the facts. If any such charge is being made, I think it is excessive and our Government ought not to permit it.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I have no knowledge whatever about that; but I question whether anyone is in a position to make a statement of that kind upon anything other than wild speculation, because the ships are not used on the basis of per capita cost of transportation.

Mr. MADDEN. No; but it would figure up.

Mr. SHERLEY. But there are so many varying factors in regard to each ship that I question very much whether anybody has figured it out.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it would be an interesting tabulation and ought to be figured up.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no information about it. It did not occur to me to make that particular inquiry at the time the matter was under consideration.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

WAR INDUSTRIES BOARD.

For expenses of the War Industries Board, including personal and other services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, rent of offices and grounds, traveling expenses, per diem in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4, supplies and equipment, law books, books of reference, periodicals, newspapers, repair and upkeep of buildings, and printing and binding, \$2,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from Kentucky make a statement as to the personal services provided for in this item, which includes traveling expenses, rent, etc., running up to \$2,000,000. This is the board of which Mr. Baruch is chairman?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is what has resulted from the old Council of National Defense?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; it is simply what was a part of the Council of National Defense. It was carved out of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It grows out of the Council of National Defense?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The head of it is Mr. Baruch?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is the real center of the entire system with regard to distribution of supplies, labor, and so forth. May I ask whether the members of the War Industries Board are paid a salary?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I think a few of them are, but I can not give the gentleman that exact fact. They asked for a total sum of \$3,765,825, and they had divided it under various heads in connection with the salaries of the employees attendant upon the members of the board, on the price-fixing committee, on the administration, and the various committees that are operating under this War Industries Board.

There is no possible way by which we could determine absolutely just what moneys were needed. All of this money is practically for the payment of salaries of employees, with the exception of that which goes to a limited extent for printing, stationery, furniture, and other equipment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The board is divided up into departments according to the business, occupations, or industries, and very many men who are prominent in those industries are here in Washington a great deal of their time in conjunction with the board. They are given credit for patriotic and self-sacrificing work.

Mr. SHERLEY. There are 243 of those men who draw \$1 a year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This has come now to be a permanent institution. They started out as \$1 a year men on patriotic lines and they were enthusiastic in offering their services to the Government. I want to know whether we continue to pay them only \$1 a year or whether now, by reason of the War Industries Board having come to be a permanent institution, those men are still devoting their services to the Government and the War Industries Board substantially without compensation?

Mr. SHERLEY. Two hundred and forty-three of them are. If the gentleman will turn to page 1097 of the hearings, he will find the number of employees and the salaries that are being paid. On page 1098 he will find the salaries according to the character of occupation of the employees.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me ask the gentleman a plain question. Does Mr. Baruch derive any compensation from the Government?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not. I have no doubt Mr. Baruch actually spends considerable money out of his own pocket and he himself gets no salary or compensation of any kind.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He is here necessarily most of his time, and probably has given up all other business. Mr. Baruch is a very wealthy man, because it was reported only recently that he very patriotically subscribed for \$1,000,000 worth of the fourth liberty loan, a very creditable thing for him to do. I would like to know whether such men are expected to stay here in Washington throughout the year, as Mr. Baruch is doing, without receiving any compensation whatever?

Mr. SHERLEY. I doubt if Mr. Baruch would accept any compensation, and I suspect that is true as to a considerable number of these other 243 men. There are a number of experts who are being paid salaries somewhat commensurate with their value, not what they would get commercially but a living value, and the gentlemen will find that set out. I want to say this touching the general work of the War Industries Board. The wisdom or lack of wisdom with which that board performs its functions will have more to do with the real production of this country in the way of war material than any other single agency in the Government. Its work is of the very first magnitude and can not be exaggerated in its importance. It is a great work. To-day they are being required to say to private industry, "You shall curtail your industry to a certain extent." They are also saying to private industry, "You shall stabilize your prices and ask only a certain maximum price." They have done that recently in regard to shoes by the elimination of many unnecessary styles and the standardizing of the different prices of shoes and fixing the price, and they have made it possible for the shoe industry to continue to manufacture at a reasonable profit and yet supply to the country shoes at very much less retail than under the old competitive condition in which each manufacturer had to make many more different styles than there was any real need for and which if he did not make he would suffer by virtue of the competition of other manufacturers who did. Now, that is a fair sample of much of the work that has come more and more within the domain of the War Industries Board. Then, as the gentleman well knows, all priorities in connection with Government work must be cleared through the

War Industries Board, both as to raw material and many finished articles which go to make the raw material of some other article.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the force of what the gentleman says. I think he has made a correct analysis of the work of this board and of its usefulness, but my inquiry was directed with a view of ascertaining how many men still devote their services to the Government for nothing, and he has answered by giving the figures—

Mr. SHERLEY. Two hundred and forty-three.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. These men are more or less interested, many of them, in the particular lines of industry they are called to sit in judgment upon as representatives of the War Industries Board. Complaints have come to me from many people who are interested in one line of business or another with respect to the manner in which they are obliged to go to their competitors to obtain a judgment from the War Industries Board. That is to say, a man who may be an importer in a certain line of business—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A man who may be an importer and who desires certain information with regard to his particular line of business finds upon inquiry of the War Industries Board that the whole matter, which is vital to him and may also be vital to the Nation, is intrusted to his chief competitor, and that if he has any business secrets he must reveal them to his competitor who holds this position with the Government at a nominal consideration. It has occurred to me that it might be well for this Nation to pay its officers, even on the War Industries Board, so that it could have a check upon them and might at least know that the industry was getting a fair deal. I assume we do not want to crush business competition.

Mr. SHERLEY. In answer to that, I will say to the gentleman this, expressing simply my own thoughts, that I do not believe that the paying of any salaries to these men of high place is going to insure in any degree their honor. Unless a man is a man of honesty in the first instance, the paying to him of \$15,000 salary or \$25,000 salary is not going to have any effect. The only other remedy to prevent the situation that he complains of—and I am not admitting it is not the usual situation, but I think it will be found the exception rather than the rule—would be to obtain men who had the requisite information and were not engaged in any way in commercial life, and that is very much easier proposed than done. You are more or less bound to take men who are leaders in the trades that they are dealing with if you are to get that information which is a necessary predicate for action and judgment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Inasmuch as I think there is still time, let me ask the gentleman this: The last provision in this bill contemplates the appointment of a "war salvage commission" of seven men, to be appointed by the President, whose salaries are not to exceed \$10,000 per annum. If we can get 234 patriotic men who are willing to serve in the War Industries Board for nothing—although many people suggest that their interest in their particular lines of business may be of some concern to them—why can not we get seven men to serve on this war salvage commission who are equally patriotic with the men in the War Industries Board?

Mr. SHERLEY. We could, and for that reason, when I read that, I avoided the payment of \$10,000 salary.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would not want them to serve for a dollar a year.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not going to admit, myself, that I can make a man honest, whom I entrust with responsibilities that run into the millions and maybe the billions, by paying him \$10,000 a year. He is going to be honest because he is honest, or he is going to be dishonest because he is dishonest, and not because of the \$10,000. It is too small to count as a factor, but the reason that I provided for a compensation of \$10,000, if necessary, is this: There are men in the country who are men of high intelligence and ability and who have the means to serve for nothing, and I did not want to exclude such men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I think I might perform some services to my Government that are of value. I trust I am doing it now, but it so hap-

pens that I would not be able to do it unless I received some compensation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SHERLEY. And that is true of a good many of us.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will place the gentleman's ability, his integrity, and his patriotism against that of any man in the War Industries Board who is serving for a dollar a year. For that reason I would not prejudice the right of such gentlemen as he to serve on that board. We would do so if we permitted to serve only those who are willing to serve for nothing.

Mr. SHERLEY. Nobody is prohibited from paying salaries to members on the War Industries Board, and, in point of fact, they are paying salaries to some men whose circumstances make it necessary.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman explain how these dollar-a-year men came to serve on this board?

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the gentleman answers that question, will he permit me to ask—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me to ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin in a moment.

I will answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] by saying they are appointed by the President. Mr. Baruch was appointed by the President under the act, as I recall it. I have not gone into the matter for some months, but at the time the Council for National Defense was formed it was provided it should consist of certain Cabinet officers, and that then under them there might be such subsidiary committees and commissions as were thought desirable. I say "appointed by the President." I do not think that he undertakes in each instance to pick out the individual man, but men in whom he has confidence in working out the constantly changing and growing problems suggest men for that particular work. The committee did not go into the matter at this time because we could not go into it.

Mr. KREIDER. I am not criticizing—

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand.

Mr. KREIDER. I am simply asking for information.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am explaining why I can not give the gentleman quite the information I would like to give. My impression is that the men who are engaged in this work are men who have all met with the approval of the President or those gentlemen in his counsel whom he trusts.

Mr. KREIDER. I wish to say that I have been approached by at least one man, and he asked me this question that I have propounded to the gentleman from Kentucky, and I was unable to answer him. That is the reason why I wanted to know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the question was propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee was discussing the question of the salary of the members of the salvage commission. I wish to direct an inquiry to the gentleman as to whether he has considered fixing the salaries of the members of this commission on a per diem basis for the days they serve in doing this work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not; and for this reason: I believe that any man who is put on that commission ought to be prepared to give all his time to it. It is a big enough job to engage the entire attention of the ablest men that exist to-day anywhere.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the thought occurred to me that the character of men we should have should be men of great business ability, heads of great manufacturing establishments, who are to-day receiving, maybe, \$100,000 a year as salary, and who would be only too glad, like these dollar-a-year men are, to give sufficient time to the great problems connected with the salvage of Government establishments, and yet would not be willing to and could not give their entire time to that work; and to award them a compensation as we do in other instances of \$25 a day would tend to make them perfectly willing to do this service.

For instance, Mr. John Dodge, of Dodge Bros., is recognized everywhere as one of the great industrial leaders of the country. He might be only too glad to serve and give his best thought and study to the great problems that will come before the salvage commission, and yet, if he were paid a year's

salary, it might preclude him from serving, as an annual salary presupposes that he was to give all of his time to the work, and he could not give all of his time to it by reason of his present responsible business engagements.

Mr. SHERLEY. The provision does not require the payment of \$10,000. It does not even require the payment of the same amount to different individuals. It simply provides that they shall not be paid more than \$10,000 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes that under the form of the phraseology all these civilian commissioners will get the same salary?

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope not, because I think some of them ought not to receive the same salary as others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the subject is under consideration I merely wish to advance this thought: I know the gentleman from Kentucky has given it much more thought than I have, although since it was proposed before the general committee I have been revolving it in my mind. I think this work will require the very highest order of business ability, and the men you wish to obtain are men who are now engaged in the management of large industrial enterprises; not the cast-offs and the business scraps of industry, but big men receiving \$50,000 and \$100,000 a year salary. They are perfectly willing to serve and study at night, and make examination of these sites, and make hurried trips, at whatever compensation the Government sees fit to pay. If you make the maximum salary \$10,000 you are not going to get, in my opinion, that character of men, and that is the character of men we should obtain. By paying them a per diem salary you do not foreclose them from accepting, but fix a yearly salary and they are precluded because these other engagements prevent them from giving all their time to this work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For employees in the Department of State, \$136,000: *Provided*, That not more than six persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the legislative appropriation bill for the present fiscal year we granted to the Secretary of State a considerably increased amount for clerical services which he had not been previously authorized to have, namely, \$200,000. Now, we have here an additional appropriation. That \$200,000 was in addition to the appropriations to his regular statutory force and temporary employees, the latter carrying, respectively, \$54,000 and \$73,000, which have been carried the last several years.

I wish to inquire what is the special need of giving him an additional appropriation of \$136,000 so shortly after the Secretary of State came before the committee in the preparation of the legislative appropriation bill? When we prepared the legislative appropriation bill the war was at its peak. We granted to him all, or nearly all, I believe, that he asked for additional clerical services. We have been voting to this department thousands and thousands of dollars right along for additional clerical services. What is the occasion now of voting \$136,000 more for the remainder of the fiscal year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that this appropriation does not contemplate increasing the force now employed in the Department of State. In other words, it does not provide for any additional clerks, but it simply is to enable the State Department to take care of the force that it now has employed. The gentleman will notice that it does not provide for an increase of pay of any clerks, and the same limitation is put upon this appropriation as was carried on the original appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, in that particular I make a different construction of the present provision from that which the gentleman has just made. Under the existing legislative bill there is a limitation that out of the \$200,000 not more than six persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 a year. Now, you make an appropriation of \$136,000 and enact the same provision. I take it that under this appropriation of \$136,000 he could employ six additional persons at salaries above \$1,800 per annum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. This provision here is simply intended to carry along the six persons who were employed on the original appropriation at salaries exceeding \$1,800, and it is not contemplated by the State Department to pay anyone out of this sum, or the original sum, more than \$1,800, with the exception of the six persons.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice, in just glancing over the hearings, that the gentleman was present when this item was under consideration before the subcommittee, and I wish to inquire for what purposes are these large sums to be used? I have glanced over it, not reading it as carefully as I should, but it gives the impression that the State Department wants this additional amount for the employment of economists and other expert employees to study conditions leading up to the preparation of peace terms.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I will say to the gentleman that this particular appropriation, as explained by the State Department, is not to be used for the employment of experts such as economists.

Mr. STAFFORD. On page 832 I find this colloquy:

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Just what will you need men of these qualifications for—

Referring to the question answered previously as to there being economists and men of that type.

Mr. Carr says:

Because in the work of preparing for the peace conference, post-war commerce, treaty revision, and examination of claims there must be made a number of studies of economic conditions, political conditions, and legal questions that can not be made by the ordinary clerk. We have to have men of more ability for that kind of work; also men who can take charge of the handling of correspondence, and the direction of action upon it, and so on.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the gentleman noted on page 836, beginning near the top of the page, the questions that I asked Mr. Carr? I think my questions and Mr. Carr's answers make it very clear that the amount which we have granted to the department simply provides for the force they now have; but it will give them authority to grant larger salaries to some six clerks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman from Wyoming takes a different position, in construing this paragraph, to that of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not so understand.

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is that we provide for the force that is now in the department.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. MONDELL. But that we do provide for six new salaries in excess of \$1,800.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are not new salaries. They are simply to carry six employees who are now employed in the State Department at salaries exceeding \$1,800. I am quite sure that it is not the purpose of the State Department to employ out of this sum more than six people at salaries exceeding \$1,800. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that the original estimate submitted by the State Department calls for \$250,000. It appeared in the hearings that it was the purpose of the State Department to use \$50,000 of that sum for the employment of experts—economists and others of expert ability and qualifications. It further appeared in the hearings that they are employing quite a number of men of expert ability and paying them out of the \$700,000 appropriated in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, with which the gentleman is familiar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Quite familiar.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The committee felt that since they were using the \$700,000 fund, or a portion of it, for the employment of experts who are economists, and so forth, it would hardly be wise to make an appropriation here of \$50,000 and give them two funds for the same purpose. And hence the committee cut out the \$50,000, and also reduced the estimate to \$136,000, so as not to provide for the employment of a clerical force in addition to the force now employed.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not understand the viewpoint of the State Department. They came before the legislative subcommittee in January of this year and asked for an appropriation of \$264,000. The original appropriation that they asked for was \$120,000. After careful consideration we voted them \$200,000, and that is in the existing law. Now, the gentleman from Tennessee states that this \$136,000 is not for the employment of any additional employees, but merely for those employees now in the department. There must be a conflict there, because the State Department is subject to the same law as other departments that does not permit them to employ any additional employees except those for which appropriations are carried in the appropriation bill. There is an inconsistency in the gentle-

men's position. He says it is not for the employment of any more employees, and yet the department has no authority to employ any greater number of employees than those covered in the \$200,000 that the Congress voted them in the legislative bill. I think some explanation should be made of that position on the part of the State Department.

Mr. MONDELL. The State Department estimated that the sum of \$250,000 was needed for additional employees, and they stated very clearly the purposes for which these people were to be employed. They asked that out of that additional appropriation for employees they might pay 25 a sum in excess of \$1,800. They clearly indicated the character of the employment proposed. It developed in the hearings that, under the appropriation of \$200,000 which was granted in the legislative bill, the State Department had employed a sufficient number of people to amount to a pay roll of \$336,000 for the year. In other words, their present pay roll is \$136,000 for the year in excess of the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. How is the State Department authorized to employ a clerical force that requires the payment of \$336,000 when the legislative appropriation bill, which was the basis for their employment of their clerical force, only authorized them to employ at the annual rate of \$200,000?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not recall at this moment just the exact language of the provision in the legislative bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] may have it before him, but I have assumed, from the statement of the State Department, that that appropriation of \$200,000 was so worded that the State Department could use their discretion to a certain extent in the employment of people under it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The language is very general. It says:

For additional employees in the Department of State, \$200,000.

That does not mean \$200,000 for one month. It means \$200,000 for the entire year.

Mr. MONDELL. Not necessarily. Under general language of that sort the State Department would be fully justified in increasing its employees above a force that could be maintained for \$200,000 for the entire year.

They might need all the services in 30 or 60 days, and then the work would be completed. The Congress very clearly did not intend to give them the sum of \$200,000 to be distributed through 12 months, divided into 12 sums. The department, acting within its discretion, has increased its pay roll so that it will amount to \$336,000 for the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that it is the gentleman's construction of the law that the heads of departments, when we have voted a lump sum for employees during the entire year, can utilize the lump sum in any one month, and then come to Congress for additional appropriation? Is not the gentleman aware of the provision of the law carried in the sundry civil act which requires the heads of departments to allot appropriations to the respective quarters throughout the year and not exceed them?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Wyoming does not pretend to know so much about the fine points of legislative limitation in regard to employments as the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is an expert in that particular line. My opinion is that the appropriation granted in the form in which this was need not be allotted by months.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DEWALT). The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. The department must necessarily exercise its good judgment and discretion in making up its force under that kind of an appropriation. Congress may decide when the sum is used up to make no further appropriation for that purpose. The State Department made so good a showing that the committee was of the opinion that we should grant them a sum sufficient to keep a force of the present size, not necessarily the same force, but a force of the present size continually employed. As one member of the committee, my further understanding is that they can increase the salaries of six of these additional employees above \$1,800, but in that event it might be necessary for them to somewhat limit their present force. At any rate, we do not grant them any new employees.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask the indulgence of the gentleman from Kentucky a moment. I had marked an inquiry on the War Trade Board paragraph, and while it is going back the gentleman

can explain the matter in a moment or two. The transfer to its own use of the amounts collected by a bureau is rather an unusual proceeding, and I want to ask the gentleman why it was permitted in this case.

Mr. SHERLEY. Some time ago, when the sundry civil bill was up, the War Trade Board called the attention of the committee to the fact that they were required to expend a considerable amount of money in cable charges at the instance of the exporters; that it was subsequently repaid, and that if they were required to cover it into the Treasury they would have to ask in the appropriations for a larger sum of money in order to take care of this expense. We therefore carried a provision that the sums collected from the exporters for telegraph tolls should be usable by the department, they having paid the money out in the first instance. At that time they neglected to call attention to the fact that the same thing occurred as to importers and others who did not come within the technical term of exporters. As the gentleman knows, the War Trade Board has absolute control over imports and exports, and necessarily matters affecting exporters and importers, frequently urgent, are brought to their attention, and at the instance of these people they expend large sums in cables to find out facts upon which action may be predicated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I should think it a dangerous practice to allow moneys to remain in the hands of a bureau in this way.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the only money they get is the money to reimburse them for money paid out of an appropriation that Congress has made, and Congress has the control of it because it only gives certain moneys for the War Trade Board during the year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Money collected by a department ought to go into the Treasury.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, ordinarily; but you could not estimate how much money would be needed for cables and telegraph tolls; it would require \$300,000 or \$400,000 more appropriation for the War Trade Board.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did it appear that the cable charges amounted to a considerable sum in 1918?

Mr. SHERLEY. In three months it amounted to \$115,506.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That money actually remains in the custody of the War Trade Board.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; it was in the custody of the War Trade Board in the first instance, and they paid the bills amounting to that much and then collected them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But did not turn them into the Treasury when collected?

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And in that they deviated from the ordinary rule.

Mr. SHERLEY. We gave them that permission in regard to exporters.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the idea is to sanction that practice hereafter?

Mr. SHERLEY. We carried a provision in the sundry civil bill in regard to the exporters. We now add "importers and all other sources." It is for cable charges that the War Trade Board has paid out. I sympathize with what I know is in the gentleman's mind—that we ought not to have a department get funds from outside sources and have them reexpended, but here is a matter that is limited to the cable charges, and it did not seem that there could be any abuse of it. They pay out the cable costs in the first instance, and they have to because the private people are not permitted to use the cable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. These private parties could not use the cable except through the Government, practically, because the Government absorbs the use of the cable. Now, the individual exporter or importer needs to ascertain certain data in connection with his license that the War Trade Board issues to him. They come, and the War Trade Board incurs the expense of the cable, and after they ascertain what the expense is it is paid by the importer or exporter when it is a charge that properly belongs to him. Then that money simply goes to reimburse the fund they have had.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But it is not entered up in any way to appear to be a part of the Treasury of the United States. That is the point I am making. I think that is rather a dangerous proposition. I know how careful the gentleman is, but I want to make this brief statement in his time. Some years ago a situation just like this existed in the Treasury Department with regard to passports, affidavits, and small fees collected, with the result that there was a defalcation. It happened that the defaulter was bonded to the Government, and

the Government in course of time was protected, but it was a condition that ought not to have existed. That money should have been accounted for as it came in. This may be such a condition as would make it difficult to make these returns to the Treasury, but it seems to me that the Treasury ought to receive such moneys as come into a bureau of this kind.

Mr. SHERLEY. Speaking by and large, that is very true; but the committee only made this exception because of the circumstances surrounding it, and would not think of doing it in normal times.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not picking out this particular board, but can the gentleman state whether the particular officials who have charge of this fund, rising in three months to as much as \$115,000, as indicated by the gentlemen, are bonded?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know about that. All of the disbursing officers in all of the departments are bonded. The head of the War Trade Board is Mr. Vance McCormick, a man of very high standing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is money that comes in in relatively small amounts?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; five and ten and fifteen dollars at a time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The danger is in having that money around, and it is just a question whether it ought not to be reported to the Treasury. My judgment is that it should be.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course it is reported to the Treasury, and is simply credited to their appropriation. The money is not paid out without its going into the Treasury. When they get it they turn it over to the Treasury, but they turn it over to their account instead of turning it over as miscellaneous receipts, so that there is a Treasury auditing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This relieves them to a certain extent from going to the gentleman's Committee on Appropriations and asking for money; and my opinion, as a Member of Congress, is that we ought to permit no department, no bureau that is regularly in business now as this one is, to escape that responsibility. They should go before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. They do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And tell his committee what they want.

Mr. SHERLEY. They do come every year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So that the gentleman has some check upon them.

Mr. SHERLEY. They do come every year.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of diplomatic and consular officers: For the transportation of diplomatic and consular officers in going to and returning from their posts, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$20,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question. Is it the purpose to make a number of new appointments of clerks in embassies and legations?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. The department asked for additional moneys on account of the increasing burden that exists in the legations and embassies abroad. The committee did not give the amount they asked. I did not personally conduct this hearing, so that I am not familiar with the details of the figures; but my impression is that they asked for \$200,000, and we allowed them \$125,000.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry with reference to the \$2,000,000 appropriation for the War Industries Board?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman yesterday stated that the committee did not favor increasing the number of employees here in Washington—that is, clerks and stenographers. Will the \$2,000,000 enable the War Industries Board to employ a large number of additional clerks?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not. Some part of their expense was for expense away from Washington and part of it was to take care of an existing force. They asked actually for \$3,750,000. We gave them \$2,000,000; and we gave them that not with the idea of increasing the existing force, but maintaining it through the year, with perhaps some expense outside of Washington that is not now being incurred.

Mr. WALSH. My question was prompted by the language "including personal and other services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere."

Mr. SHERLEY. That is just the usual language; but, of course, some of this money goes into the District, but it goes for the rest of the months of this fiscal year and for existing pay rolls. It is just the same language that was used before.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

American citizens and prisoners of war in Germany: For relief of American citizens in Germany or in German-occupied territory, and American prisoners of war who may be taken by German forces, \$200,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Referring to this item of \$200,000 for American citizens and prisoners of war in Germany, may I ask why that is in this bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. Because they are short of money. They had about \$80,000 and they figured that there are some 2,000 people they need to make provisions for, and they need this additional money. They can not tell just what the expenses are. Those expenses are incurred by the Spanish Government through the Spanish ambassador and, of course, the Federal Government reimburses any expenditure the Spanish Government may make.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is this deficiency appropriation to make up for the pay of such Americans as may be prisoners in Germany?

Mr. SHERLEY. To make up the expense of looking after those prisoners.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is not for salaries or compensation?

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. For relief of American citizens in Germany—just what kind of relief is that?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will quote from the testimony of Mr. Carr:

Under a provisional reciprocal arrangement with the German Government, pending a definite determination of the questions at the conference now in session at Berne, American officers who are prisoners of war in Germany are paid salaries by the German Government to be eventually reimbursed by the United States at approximately the rate of \$80 per month up to and including the grade of captain and \$90 per month for higher grades. Privates are, however, paid no salaries. The latter class in particular are dependent upon the clothing and food furnished by the German Government, and that has been found to be so inadequate that the soldiers look largely to the packages of food they receive through the Red Cross. It is practically imperative, therefore, that our soldiers be given small amounts of money immediately after capture to meet immediate needs, this amount to be returned by them if reciprocal arrangements can be made on the part of Germany as to the payment of salaries to prisoners of war. At present officers are paid an initial sum of \$50 and noncommissioned officers and privates \$15 to meet their first expenses after capture, such as extra clothing, etc. It is obvious that their welfare demands these payments as well as others with which they may procure from time to time through the American prisoners' central committee in Berne certain articles necessary to their comfort and welfare, such as surgical appliances, artificial limbs, books, musical instruments, etc. It is for this kind of relief of prisoners that this appropriation is requested, and as has been explained the initial payments specified are to be reimbursed to the Government eventually.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did I understand in the earlier part of the reading that American prisoners are paid something by Germany?

Mr. SHERLEY. They are being paid something now provisionally, just as we are paying to German officers who are prisoners of the United States certain money, and there is at the present time a conference at Berne, of which Mr. John Davis, the present Solicitor General and who has been designated as the coming ambassador to England, is a member, for the purpose of adjusting with the German Government this whole matter of care and treatment of prisoners of war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Apparently the main question is largely a diplomatic one. I have some inquiry concerning one particular prisoner of war. His pay allotment is not coming along. The question has arisen whether by reason of his being a prisoner of war his pay stops. If, being a prisoner of war, he is made some allowance by Germany, this appropriation apparently is to make good ultimately the difference between his salary and that which Germany allows him. It is a matter I should like to have more fully explained if the gentleman is familiar with it.

Mr. SHERLEY. What the gentleman is confusing is that this particular provision is a question whether men who have been captured as prisoners of war shall be continued to be paid by this Government and draw salaries, and the comptroller held that the payment ceases. There has just been passed through the House, at the instance of the Committee on Military Affairs, a bill to take care of that situation, and I have no doubt it will speedily be enacted in the Senate, to permit the payment of men who are reported lost or missing or who are prisoners of war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am obliged to the gentleman for the information.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman from Kentucky permit a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Considering the very great losses which are taking place in the present battles, does not the gentleman think that the situation has changed since the hearings and that this sum might very well be made considerably larger to provide for all contingencies?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it is larger than any need to make it, but the State Department very recently, within a week or 10 days, made this estimate. They do not know what funds they need, and the amount that is appropriated here will not be the determining factor. Moneys will be paid to the extent that is necessary, and whatever difference there may be the Congress will willingly appropriate.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. TILSON. There is no part of this that goes to the pay of the enlisted man?

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. TILSON. This is entirely to take care of their interests while they are there?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. This money is to pay advances made to the soldiers to supply them with funds that they may need when captured and during their captivity, and then subsequently they may or may not be reimbursed.

Mr. TILSON. It appeared there was considerable hardship upon the families of certain soldiers who were captured in Germany that came before the committee of which I am a member.

Mr. SHERLEY. That came before the Committee on Appropriations, and they asked legislation be carried in the bill. I suggested to them that we would do it if necessary, but I was sure the Committee on Military Affairs would gladly consider and report a bill, and I thought that was the better procedure, and accordingly the matter came before the gentleman's committee, and they did report it immediately.

Mr. TILSON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

International Trade-Mark Registration Bureau: For the annual share of the United States for the expenses of the maintenance of the International Trade-Mark Registration Bureau at Habana, including salaries of the director, and counselor, assistant director and counselor, clerks, translators, secretary to the director, stenographers, and typewriters, messenger, watchmen, and laborers, rent of quarters, stationery, and supplies, including the purchase of books, postage, traveling expenses, and the cost of printing the bulletin, \$56,450.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, I desire to ask the chairman if this is not anticipating a pending bill now before the Committee on Patents or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not understand so. This is under an existing agreement as to our part of the expenditures of this bureau. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] can perhaps give the gentleman even more detailed information.

Mr. WALSH. I am under the impression that there is a sort of tentative agreement in reference to this International Trade-Mark Bureau and that it is legislation to put an agreement into binding force and effect and that the legislation is now pending before one or two committees of the House, and I think this appropriation is practically the legislation that is desired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman this is to carry out an agreement made by this Nation with the Central and South American Republics and also with the island of Cuba which was made August 20, 1910, at Buenos Aires. Under that convention and agreement there were to be two bureaus established, one at Habana, and in that organization to be the United States, Cuba, and the Central American Republics.

Mr. WALSH. What year did the gentleman state?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. August 20, 1910.

Mr. WALSH. Why was it not carried in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because it is only just recently that the agreement has been signed and entered into by all the countries involved.

Mr. WALSH. That is just the point I am making, that the legislation to permit the agreement did not permit the appropriation of this sum and the authorization of the employment of all these officials.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that Mr. Carr, of the State Department, stated that—

On August 20, 1910, the Fourth National Conference of the American States of Buenos Aires formally adopted a convention for the protection of trade-marks. The convention was ratified by the United States on the 21st of March, 1911, and proclaimed by the President on September 16, 1916. It has also been ratified by Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, and Costa Rica. The convention provides for two registration bureaus, one at Habana and one at Rio de Janeiro, and that at Rio de Janeiro was intended to deal with applications for the 10 Republics of South America, while that at Habana was intended to serve North and Central America and the West Indian Republics. Each bureau was to be established as soon as two-thirds of the countries comprising the group which it was to serve should have ratified the convention. The requirements as to the ratification having been met in the northern group, the Cuban Government, charged with the administrative execution of the convention, was able in the winter of 1917 to initiate the bureau at Habana. On July 16, 1918, the President of Cuba promulgated a law for the initial expenses of the bureau, and in August of the present year a director of the bureau visited Washington and conferred with the appropriate officials of this Government concerning the regulations to carry the convention into effect. The convention provides that the expenses shall be defrayed by the signatory States in the same proportions as that established for the International Bureau of American Republics, namely, all contributions being in proportion to population.

That places upon us the obligation to pay our quota of the expenses in accordance with the treaty or convention. That quota is determined in exactly the same way as that of the International Bureau of American Republics is determined and amounts to this amount that we have here, \$56,450.

This sum is simply appropriated to carry into effect the treaty and agreement made by this country with the other countries named.

Mr. WALSH. This convention provides that the expenses shall be defrayed. Now, this paragraph provides not for defraying the expenses but for paying salaries of a director, a counselor, assistants, stenographers, secretaries, rent of quarters, and in fact the establishment of a new bureau.

It is legislation in the nature of an authorization. If this item read for the payment of expenses incurred under a convention entered into between these Governments there could be no exception taken to the item. I think clearly this establishes a bureau.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Undoubtedly it establishes a bureau, and that is exactly what was established by the convention and treaty to which I referred, and that necessarily carries with it a director and the employment of the necessary force in order to conduct the business of the bureau. The gentleman will notice that this provision simply provides for the annual share of the United States for the expenses of the maintenance of the International Trade-mark Registration Bureau at Habana, and so forth.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that if the item stopped right there after the word "Habana," on line 18, and then carried the appropriation, it would do all we seek to do.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Absolutely.

Mr. MONDELL. The balance is simply detail with regard to the character of the expense.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can not quite agree with the interpretation that has been placed upon this, and I think the paragraph is subject to a point of order. This convention was ratified on the 21st of March, 1911.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will yield, it was ratified by the United States—

Mr. WALSH. On the 21st of March, 1911.

Mr. MONDELL. That is right. And proclaimed on September 16, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. If the Chair will permit me just a moment further to get some additional information, I wish to say that it was proclaimed by the President on September 16, 1916.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct, so far as the proclamation of the President of the United States is concerned, but if the gentleman will look further in the hearings—

Mr. WALSH. That is the President of Cuba.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The President of Cuba promulgated the law for the initial expense of the bureau on July 16, 1918.

Mr. WALSH. That is the point I make, the initial expenses of the bureau; but this is the annual share of the United States. And we have not enacted any legislation as the result of that convention, which was agreed to and proclaimed, and authorized the establishment of this bureau.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The treaty in itself, I will say to the gentleman, has all the authority of law in the matter.

Mr. WALSH. We have not the treaty before us. We have the statement of Mr. Carr that this convention was ratified and provides for two registration bureaus. We do not know whether

it provides for directors or assistant directors, watchmen or laborers. It is clearly legislation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman desires it, so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to see that language stricken out, and stop at the word "Habana," and simply provide for the annual share of the expenses of the United States. But I really believe it is best to leave the language in there, for the simple reason that Congress will know exactly for what purpose this money is being appropriated and used from time to time. But if the gentleman wishes the language stricken out, for one I have no objection.

Mr. WALSH. We do not know. We know we have a lot of directors and stenographers and typewriters, and that they are buying a lot of books and postage. We do not know what the director gets, or what they are spending for stenographers and typewriters. And this is clearly legislation. And I should be inclined to make a point of order against the paragraph, although, if the gentleman—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman I do not think it is subject to a point of order, because it is provided for under a treaty made by this country with Cuba and certain Central American Republics, which is the supreme law of the land.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think the Appropriations Committee—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is authorized under the law.

Mr. WALSH (continuing). Has acquired jurisdiction to bring in legislation on an appropriation bill simply because some treaty has been entered into providing for us to pay a portion of the expenses of an international trade-mark bureau.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is not legislation. It is merely an appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. My contention is that it certainly is legislation when it provides for salaries of directors, counselors, and so forth, that have never heretofore been provided for. There is no law on the statute books authorizing their appointment, and I doubt very much if this treaty goes into such details as that. And I make the point of order that the paragraph is not in order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I understand, the language to which the gentleman objects is contained on line 18 after the word "Habana" down to and including line 22.

Mr. WALSH. No; I object to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point, and it seems to be somewhat of an important question. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he is willing to permit the point of order to go over so as to give the Chair opportunity to look into the matter?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] willing to let the paragraph go over?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no objection. I am satisfied, however, it is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Chair understand the gentleman from Kentucky to say that it is subject to a point of order?

Mr. SHERLEY. That it is not subject to a point of order. But if the Chair desires to obtain further information I am perfectly willing to let it go over. As a matter of fact, the question is immaterial as compared to other sections in the bill, and I am anxious to expedite the passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there seems to be this question involved, namely, as to whether a treaty, without previous legislation having been had, gives authority to make an appropriation. That is the thing that is in the Chair's mind at this time. That is the thing that is in the mind of the Chair at the time.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think a treaty the moment it becomes approved by the ratification of the Senate becomes the law of the land just as much as any act of Congress, and I think there are any number of precedents to that effect; and it being the law, this is simply an appropriation to carry out the terms of it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the impression that the Chair has.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Chair permit me to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Kentucky?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does it appear anywhere in the hearing that the treaty provides that this bureau shall have a director, counselor, translators, and these various other officials?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; but the treaty provides for the expenses of this registration bureau, and that would include legitimate expenses, such as the salary of director, counselor, and so forth.

Mr. WALSH. It would include the expenses that the Congress authorized in the way of providing for officials.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I differ with the gentleman, but I would rather not take the time of the committee now. The

Chair has suggested that he would like to look into the matter further, and I suggest that it go over and we continue with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire to delay. If a conclusion is reached before the adjournment this afternoon, the Chair will have passed upon the matter. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of officers and employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$6,000,000; stationery and minor office supplies, \$300,000; furniture, equipment, and supplies, including existing deficiency of \$313,874 for addressograph equipment, file cabinets, typewriters, etc., for immediate needs, \$750,000; field investigation and branch offices, \$500,000; miscellaneous expenses, including telephones, telegrams, freight, express, car tickets in the District of Columbia, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$30,000; in all, \$7,580,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is a very large appropriation, and so far as the salaries of officers and employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere are concerned they amount to \$6,000,000. I do not know just what check the committee has on the distribution of that large sum for salaries. Apparently no effort has been made to itemize them, although I presume the committee has a report on that subject.

Mr. SHERLEY. The salaries they pay are the usual statutory salaries, and the estimate that was submitted to the committee showed the salaries that were being paid. There are 1 or 2 people who will draw \$5,000 each, 1 who draws \$4,832, 1 who draws \$4,000, 6 who draw \$3,500 each, 23 who draw \$3,000 each, 26 who draw \$2,500 each, 50 who draw \$2,000 each, 1 who draws \$1,890, 158 who draw \$1,800 each, 7 who draw \$1,700 each, 9 who draw \$1,680 each, 55 at \$1,600 each, and so on down to the lowest salaries of \$240.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is the salary of the chief of the bureau now?

Mr. SHERLEY. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. An effort was made some time ago to increase that, and if my recollection is not awry it failed. There has been a change in the head of the bureau recently, has there not?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. De Lanoy has resigned, I understand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is a very important bureau of the Government, and its importance is increasing every day, as every Member of Congress can very readily attest. But this being a deficiency appropriation, and a very large one at that, I would like to know whether by virtue of this appropriation we may expect that the work of the bureau may be accelerated?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would not say by virtue of this appropriation. I hope that as the bureau becomes better and better organized we will get better service. I have at times been somewhat critical of the bureau, and yet it is only fair to say that it has probably had the biggest task of any single bureau of the Government, outside of a department like the War Department. The amount of insurance, for instance, that this bureau is carrying exceeds manyfold all of the insurance of all of the private insurance companies in America and elsewhere. There is something like \$34,000,000,000 worth of insurance that this bureau is now supervising and carrying for the Government, and the task is really a Herculean one.

I know that Members of Congress have and continue to have cause for complaint, due to mistakes in allotments or failure to make allotments, and so forth, and there have been in the past a good many things that have been the proper subject of complaint. But alongside of that there must be borne in mind the tremendous magnitude of the task that has been imposed on this bureau.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I concede the magnitude of the work, and I would like to help those in charge to advance it. It seems to me the pay of the chief of the bureau is not what it ought to be, considering the responsibility he has.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, but the committee did not feel warranted, particularly at the time this hearing was had, to increase the pay of the head of the bureau.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But this much I wanted to say in the presence of the gentleman and his committee, that for a long time, having due regard to the difficulties confronting this bureau, the correspondence with my office was generally very satisfactory. I had no fault to find with it. But I have observed recently that it has fallen back considerably, and that some letters are much delayed, which, I assume, may be due

to the fact that they have not sufficient force, or they have not got their machinery together, as they would like to have it; for that reason I inquired if this appropriation meant that the work may be hastened so that complaints may be lessened.

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not represent all they asked, but it does represent what the committee thought was sufficient, in view of the fact that considerable machinery has been purchased and is being installed for expediting work in addressing letters and in making out checks, and so forth, and the bureau will this winter get installed in the Arlington Building, instead of being scattered in some 13 buildings all over the town, and that again ought to expedite the work. I really think that this is one of those problems that are not solved simply by piling in money for additional clerks. It is solved by the gradual settling down of an organization along lines of efficiency.

It was to be expected that with work of this magnitude there would be much of confusion and of trouble.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If they could get this work all under one roof, probably it would be much better all around.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman thinks that is likely to eventuate this winter?

Mr. SHERLEY. They are to have six or seven floors of the Arlington, and while they will still have certain work outside it will be work that is not of a permanent nature. My own judgment of this bureau is this, and I think the House ought to have it in mind: I believe that the time is rapidly coming when we ought to consolidate payments, both the voluntary and the compulsory one, in one bureau instead of having them divided as they now are. I think further that there will come a consolidation of the Pension Bureau with this bureau. There ought not to be two bureaus dealing with that subject. My own judgment is that the proper committee ought to consider very carefully and prepare a bill undertaking to determine all of these factors and to provide for one organization, and that then we will have need to erect a building somewhat similar, I hope, to the new buildings for the Army and Navy in Potomac Park in which this bureau can be housed. It is destined to be the largest bureau in the Government for many years to come.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are we using the Arlington Building now?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; but within a few weeks they hope to move into some floors.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume the appropriation just passed contemplates that?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman know positively that the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance is going into the Arlington Building?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I know it from the statements made before the committee, and I know it from the personal statement of the Secretary of the Treasury to me.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman know what else is going into that building?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; the Railway Administration is going into that building.

Mr. DENISON. Will there be room for both bureaus in that building?

Mr. SHERLEY. There will not be all the room that the War-Risk Insurance Bureau ought to have at this time, but there will be six or seven floors given to them, as I recall it.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman stated awhile ago that he thought at some time the Bureau of Pensions would be consolidated with this bureau. Was it the gentleman's thought that the Bureau of Pensions would be absorbed by this bureau, or that this bureau would be absorbed by the Bureau of Pensions?

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope the Bureau of Pensions will be absorbed by this. In magnitude the Bureau of Pensions does not represent one-twentieth of what the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance represents.

Mr. DENISON. I know; but in efficiency it represents a good deal more.

Mr. SHERLEY. I question even that.

Mr. DENISON. I do not.

Mr. SHERLEY. And I am not prepared to rate this bureau too high.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I want to detain the committee only just a minute for the purpose of enforcing what the chairman of the committee [Mr. SHERLEY] said about the consolidation of this bureau. The work now done in the Quartermaster General's office and the work done in the War-Risk Insurance Bureau have caused quite a good deal of confusion. For example, wherever an allotment is made by law it goes to the

Quartermaster General, and where there is an allotment and an allowance it goes to the War-Risk Insurance Bureau. So the War-Risk Insurance Bureau handling one class of cases and the Quartermaster General handling another class of cases, it has caused quite a good deal of confusion throughout the country. When this bureau was first established the allowances were made in every case through the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance; but a provision was put into one of the bills, and the War Department contended that they had all the records and that they ought to handle it. They themselves did not seem to anticipate the enormous amount of trouble that would be entailed on that account. It ought all to be in one bureau, and in my judgment it ought to be put in the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, because the Navy has allowances, the Marine Corps has allowances, and the Lighthouse Service has allowances, as well as the Army. Therefore, it all ought to be at one place. Now, the President has the right under the Overman Act to consolidate all of this activity in one bureau, and, in my judgment, it ought to be done immediately, because they have about cleaned up the back work on the original first draft, and the next lot of soldiers who come in under this new law—ages from 18 to 45—will put in quite as many cases and quite as much labor as the original draft. Therefore, it ought all to be consolidated at this time, in my judgment.

And, in saying this, I agree very heartily with the chairman [Mr. SHERLEY] that something ought to be done at once. If it is not done in the department, the proper committees in the House and Senate ought to take up this matter and work out a very careful plan and consolidate all of this work at one place. It would save every Congressman, every Senator, every soldier, every man who has correspondence a great deal of trouble, and then you would know exactly where to fix the responsibility in the event of carelessness or delay. I believe it is necessary to be done and ought to be done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How long does the gentleman think the War-Risk Bureau is going to last?

Mr. Sisson. Of course, nobody can tell exactly. It depends on how many of our boys are injured and how much administration will have to be had to work out the legislation whereby Congress has committed itself to the soldiers in certain lines of help.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The insurance feature will necessarily tend to prolong it.

Mr. Sisson. I think, perhaps, quite a number of years; but I will say that ought to be worked out as soon as the war is over, so that the force could be gotten down to a minimum within a year or two after everything settles down. Then it becomes largely a question simply of paying what is due to the soldiers. Some of them may take it in lump sums, and some may decide to take it monthly or annually, under the other plan.

Mr. ROBBINS. There is one question I would like to ask the gentleman; this item of \$70,000,000 appropriated for the payment of the military and naval family allowances. That, I presume, is to make up the allowances made by the soldier to the family, either compulsory or voluntary, under the act. Is that the purpose of it?

Mr. Sisson. It could be used for all the purposes for which allowances are made under that act. In other words, if a man was injured and discharged from the service and wanted to settle, the money could be paid out of that sum.

Mr. ROBBINS. How does it come that it takes such an enormous amount in so short a time after the act went into force?

Mr. Sisson. I doubt very much if anybody knows to any certainty whether \$70,000,000 will be enough until the next bill becomes a law.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is the very point I wanted to ask about. The gentleman has gone into this as a member of the subcommittee and taken voluminous testimony, which I have read hastily. Does not the gentleman think the war risk is a problem as to whether we will be able to meet the terrible drain on the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. Sisson. I do not think so; in my judgment it will all be worked out without much trouble. I will state to the gentleman frankly that I am not an insurance expert. We have relied on gentlemen called into the service who are experts and who do have a knowledge of what this present arrangement will finally put upon the Government of the United States.

Mr. ROBBINS. What gives me cause for alarm is that you come in with this deficiency bill and ask for \$70,000,000 in so short a time after the act goes into force. It is becoming alarming as to the extent of the burden upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations, even if it desired to exercise the option, had none. The Congress of the United States passed a

law making certain fixed allowances for the families of the soldiers and sailors in the service. The department has to carry out that law, and comes to us with an estimate as to the money necessary. We appropriated it; but, aside from that, is the gentleman prepared to say that he does not think we ought to give the allowances that we are giving?

Mr. ROBBINS. Oh, no; not at all; exactly the reverse. I want to give them, but I wanted to know whether we are going to be able to keep faith with the soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think we are going to be able to do it; and in order to be able to do it we give them this sum.

Mr. LONDON. If the gentleman will permit, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to know if we can give this money to the soldiers and let the Government keep the money at the same time. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBBINS. Oh, no; I do not; the gentleman did not hear my question or did not understand it.

Mr. LONDON. I did not understand it.

Mr. ROBBINS. I think it is a great and beneficent plan; but what caused me some concern is the amount carried here.

Mr. SISSON. I want to say that the committee, in giving \$70,000,000, was actuated by the testimony of gentlemen who came before the committee and these gentlemen who made the estimates and who have been paying out to the soldiers this fund for this purpose. Their opinion is that under present conditions and the present number of soldiers this sum ought to carry us up until Congress meets again, and then if they need any more money they can get it.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. There was a suggestion—I do not remember who made it—that there could be a consolidation of the War-Risk Bureau and the bureau in the Quartermaster Department.

Mr. SISSON. That was made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. ESCH. And that the proper committees of the House should have the matter in charge. Would not the President under the Overman Act have the power to do that?

Mr. SISSON. I stated at the outset that the President had that power under the Overman Act, and that if he did not take the matter up and make the consolidation I was in hearty accord with the chairman of the committee that the proper committees should take the matter up and work out a plan where these activities could be consolidated. I think it would be good administration economically and be much more convenient to the country at large.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he was not afraid that if we consolidated the two departments it would be only a short time until the policy that has been pursued in regard to giving pensions will be pursued in regard to soldiers in the present war.

Mr. SISSON. I do not think that the consolidation of the departments would have a tendency to do that.

Mr. DENISON. My own judgment is that we ought to keep the two departments as far apart as we can in operation and in law.

Mr. SISSON. I think it would be good administration to consolidate them; we are incurring a great deal of useless expense in useless correspondence on the part of Members of Congress and men who have business with these bureaus.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is it not possible for the Committee on Appropriations to give the War-Risk Insurance Bureau enough money so that in some way we could find out how they are spending the money, and so that dependent families could get the allotment provided under that act? I get a dozen letters a day from people in my district, objects of charity, who have not got anything for five or six months, and they can not get any satisfaction from the War-Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. SISSON. I think, as a matter of fact, a few isolated cases might be found in all the districts. When the change was made from the Bureau of War Risk to the War Department in reference to the soldiers to whom the Government made no allotment out of the Treasury a great deal of confusion arose. Many soldiers were in France when the War Department undertook a reallocation by the soldiers and have a filing of new papers by the soldiers, and that caused a great deal of delay. But we have the assurance of a very accomplished Army officer, Gen. Lord, who seems to be in sympathy with all the purposes of the bill, anxious that the soldiers' families should get all the allowances intended under the law that they now have, and he says that they have about cleaned all that matter up. Some time

you will find that the fault has not altogether been with the Government, but the fault has been with the soldier who neglected to make the allowance to his family.

There are certain allowances under the law which the soldier himself must make. The Government can not compel him to make them. They can not compel a soldier to make an allowance to his father, his mother, his brother, or his sister.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for three minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I want only one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALLINGER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] if he will tell us whether these dependents are going to get the money for the months between the time the soldier made his original allotment and the time he starts to make his new allotment?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; if he is entitled to it under the law. This bill will carry an amount of money for the purpose of having these cases investigated. In many instances, unless there are actual dependents, they are not entitled to an allowance out of the Treasury. Therefore to prevent fraud it is necessary that many of the cases be investigated. Those allowances which are allowed by law, except in rare cases, are being paid now. In those cases where the allowance is made to a brother, father, sister, or some one where the soldier himself must make the allotment, frequently delay is caused by the soldier and not by the department.

Mr. DALLINGER. A large number of cases have come to my attention where the soldier made his original allotment on the blanks furnished and then later a ruling was made by which those allotments were canceled, and after a great deal of delay the soldier was located and told that he must make another allotment.

Mr. SISSON. That is true.

Mr. DALLINGER. What is going to become of the money allotted by the soldier between that time and the time of the second allotment? The dependents are not getting that money, and they need the money for their support. They are absolutely dependent and they can not get any satisfaction in regard to it. They have had to borrow money in order to live. Such a condition of affairs is inexcusable and a disgrace to this Government.

Mr. SISSON. If the soldier desired an allotment to be made and signs the allotment blank sent him by the War Department, that allotment will be made in accordance with the soldier's wishes, because in those cases you can not compel an allotment, except one to the wife, or to the children of the soldier in the event that the wife is dead.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. There are 5,000 prisoners in Germany. I have presented to the bureau cases of men who have made an allotment through the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance where the allotment has been canceled under this order and the man required to make a new allotment through the quartermaster. The men are in prison in Germany and can not be reached. What has been done in respect to those men?

Mr. SISSON. As a matter of fact, those soldiers do not get paid.

Mr. TEMPLE. Oh, yes; they do.

Mr. SISSON. They do not get it sent to them in Germany.

Mr. TEMPLE. It is credited to them.

Mr. SISSON. That is true, and so will this be credited to the family.

Mr. TEMPLE. But to have the money credited to them does not support the family.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman is complaining about a matter in respect to which the Appropriation Committee can give him no help. We can not make the law, because, if we did, we would have a great many criticizing us for going outside of our jurisdiction.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. One would naturally think that with 11,000 or more people in the War-Risk Bureau, who are supposed to be there for the purpose of facilitating these payments, the work could be kept current. I undertake to say that I can organize a war-risk bureau, systematize it, and get the work current with 3,500 people. They have 11,000 there.

Mr. SISSON. That will not help the case the gentleman speaks of here; that will not relieve the situation; because where those cases have been left with the War-Risk Bureau the

payments have been continued. No changes were made, but where it was transferred to the War Department is where the trouble is arising. That is a case that this committee has nothing to do with except to appropriate the money.

Mr. TEMPLE. I am very well acquainted with the fact, but the gentleman was discussing the situation, and I thought that point ought to be brought out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of trying to clear this matter up. What I want to know from the Committee on Appropriations is whether there is money enough appropriated so that where the soldier made his original allotment, where he had a dependent family, and then went off on the western front, supposing his family to be looked after, the Government having under the law promised to make an allowance in addition to the allotment, and where the War Department canceled the original allotment and after several months located the soldier and got him to make a new allotment—whether under these circumstances there is money enough appropriated to take care of the lapse in payment during the period between the first allotment and the second allotment, where the dependent family under the law was supposed to be entitled to a part of the soldier's pay plus the Government allowance. In other words, is there money enough appropriated so that even after inexcusable delay these dependents can get that money in a lump sum?

Mr. Sisson. That will be left entirely with the soldier. If the soldier wants to make a reaffirmation of the allotment, which he made in the War-Risk Bureau, it will be paid. If not, it will all be paid to the soldier himself. Nothing will be taken from the soldier.

Mr. DALLINGER. What about the allowance, the payment of which by the Government depends upon the allotment made by the soldier?

Mr. Sisson. There is no allowance handled in the War Department. All those allowances are handled in the War-Risk Insurance Bureau. The gentleman is not discussing that which is affected by that order, because the order in the War Department respected only the allowance made by himself. No allowance by the Government, because in every case where the money is paid out of the Treasury it is through the War Department. There has been no change in the War-Risk Insurance Bureau; it is in the War Department. Do I make myself plain?

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, apparently I can not make myself understood by the committee. I took the case of a soldier who originally made his allotment before leaving this country. I have hundreds of those cases in my district where soldiers went to the western front thinking their families were provided for. They had been furnished with a summary of the act which showed that if a soldier made an allotment of his pay direct to his wife or to his father or mother that the Government would add so much more. These men go away thinking that everything is taken care of. Now, there is an order issued which provides that the soldier must make a new allotment. I do not know what the reason was—it may have been a very good reason—but what I am trying to get at is this: After the soldier has made his new allotment, then, as I understand, the War-Risk Insurance Bureau will honor that and the dependent family will get the allotment and the allowance that goes with it; but what is going to happen in regard to the four or five months' pay that the soldier supposed had been given to his dependent family, plus the Government's allowance, and which the family never received?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit I think I can set him straight. The gentleman is confusing two different classes of payment. There are certain allotments made to dependents which the Government matches with funds of its own. They have always been and are now paid by the War-Risk Insurance Bureau and there has been no requirement for a new allotment on such payments. There are also certain voluntary allotments which the soldier can make and which for a while were paid through the War-Risk Insurance Bureau. Under the law it was found that the War Department should make these payments and it does now make them and it is insisting upon a new allotment, a new designation made by the soldier for the continuation of such allotment. Now, the gentleman asks what happened in the period between the time of the old determination of the soldier and the new. Touching those which are compulsory and which the Government supplements nothing happened. The family is entitled all through to receive that through the War-Risk Insurance Bureau. Touching the voluntary one in reference to the pay of the soldier when he makes his new voluntary allotment, he may make it revert back or make

it continue from the date of the new pay, because this allotment comes out of his pay and comes out of his pay only to the extent that he is willing it should come out, and so the matter is entirely in his hands, and it is not a question of the appropriation of moneys in order to take care of that sort of a situation, though it is true there has been, unfortunately, a good deal of delay and confusion in acquainting the soldier with the need of making a new allotment, and the result was that the War Department shut off payments until a new allotment was made and there were a lot of families of soldiers who were denied this allotment that the soldier thought he had made and which he was desirous of making.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have a case which the gentleman has described very accurately. The allowance was cut off, was not paid. Is it now required of that soldier, who claims to have made the request that it be paid to his family, in the event the papers are lost or anything of the kind, to make a new one?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; as I understand it, he has to make a new allotment under the decision that was reached some time ago by the department.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This soldier is in France, and some papers that he wrote me he had sent perhaps were lost, for I have never received them.

Mr. SHERLEY. The order was sent out, as I understand it, to all the commanders everywhere to acquaint the soldiers with the need of their making new allotments if they desired to make them to their families. I am talking about the voluntary allotments.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Or renewing the old?

Mr. SHERLEY. Or a renewal of the old and—

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment. I understand that the War Department states they have in large measure, they believe, brought that information to all the soldiers over the country.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] and then I will yield.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I have a case of a sailor in the United States Navy who was in my home office last Tuesday. He made an allotment in January, 1918, of \$15 a month to his wife. The money has been deducted from his pay each month. His wife has never received a single dollar of that money.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, of course, there are such cases which are inexcusable.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. There was an allowance of \$10 a month made to the wife by the Government and she never received a dollar from the allowance. Unfortunately the wife died last week. The husband happened to have a little money in the bank and he has used up all of these savings to provide the comforts and maintenance of his wife, and now he must pay the funeral expenses of his wife. His wife never received that \$10 per month which was the allowance granted by the Government.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Fifteen dollars.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. No; it was \$10 allowance made by the Government that she failed to receive, as well as the \$15 per month which was deducted monthly from his pay, but never paid to his wife. The husband will undoubtedly receive the amount of the allotment which was deducted from his pay. I think he should be entitled to the money allowed by the Government, as he was compelled to use all the money he had saved before his marriage to maintain his family while in the service of his country. This failure to pay caused a great anxiety to both the sailor and his lamented wife.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, of course, there is no excuse for a situation of that kind.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I want to say further, with regard to the change in the system of allotments and allowances, many of the soldiers are on foreign soil. They are required to make new allotments and ask for allowances and their commanding officers have the blanks the soldiers are required to fill out in the form of a questionnaire. Many of these defenders of the Nation are puzzled with the questions. The questionnaires sent to the families are equally puzzling to them.

The soldier's family are required to make a statement, and then the bureau compares the soldier's statement and the family's statement. If the statements do not agree, the allowance is cut off and the family, who depended upon the allowance because of the breadwinner being drafted into the service, is made to suffer. Besides, the family find that the assured allotment at the time of drafting is denied them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like about a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire recognition?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes; for about two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is recognized.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I have employed in my office at home, since this war began, an extra clerk and an extra stenographer to take care of all this work. I was at home from the 21st of September until I came back here yesterday, and I worked all the time I was at home, and my office was full of people who do not know anything about the law and can not understand why they have so much trouble to obtain the money due them. I realize that the business carried on in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is a very great undertaking—greater than its promoters ever imagined it could be, I presume. It is a serious situation. And I am afraid the \$70,000,000 provided in this bill will be insufficient to meet the necessities of the situation. Soldiers and sailors are dying rapidly from influenza and on the field of battle, and we shall have a great demand for money to meet the expenses of this bureau. We must not do any injustice to the soldiers and sailors who are fighting the enemy across the seas, and we must provide for their families in their absence—not in a parsimonious way but with liberality. Let us economize by cutting off useless expenditures elsewhere. Under no circumstances have so many obstacles put in the pathway of the soldiers and sailors and their families.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for a minute or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] yield the floor?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DENISON. I was wondering if the gentleman from Kentucky did not make a slight error a moment ago. I understand now that the War Department has begun the payment, since the 1st of July, where there was simply an allotment but no allowance from the Government. Is that what the gentleman stated?

Mr. SHERLEY. The War Department pays the voluntary allotment that a soldier may choose to make, and that is altogether irrespective of the compulsory allotment for dependents. The Government undertakes to supplement by payments of its own in accordance with the number of such dependents.

Mr. DENISON. Now, there has been another class of cases, where the soldier has had to sign a new allotment, according to instructions given me. There is where the soldier made an allotment of more than \$15 a month. I would like the gentleman to explain that. I have never understood it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know that I clearly understand just the case to which the gentleman refers. We first fixed the compulsory allotment that should be made, dependent upon the amount of money that the soldier received, and as that changed accordingly as he might receive promotion, there came from changes in pay endless confusion as to the amount of compulsory allotment and the amount the Government supplemented it by. We undertook to standardize that by fixing a definite sum, and it is quite possible that it was necessary in a number of cases for additional statements to be made by soldiers touching both characters of payment.

Mr. DENISON. I think that is true.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to say this further: I am not here to defend in the slightest degree the War-Risk Insurance Bureau for its failure to attend to some of these cases. I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] that a situation such as he speaks of ought not to occur. I have personally undertaken—not once, but a great many times; not only in connection with people who are constituents of mine, but in connection with the system itself—to bring to the attention of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau the need of simplifying and arranging this matter so that there would not be delay. I have a good deal of sympathy with the feeling that Members have about this matter. At the same time I try to be fair about it. It must be said in justice to these people that their task is a tremendous one, very much bigger than an ordinary survey of the field would indicate. Now, the remedies I do not know. After all, the remedy is in the efficiency of the men at the head of the bureau. That efficiency can not be determined offhand. The

men who are put at the head of the bureau are supposed to be men who have had experience in insurance life that would enable them to accomplish this task. Of course, different men will have different opinions. There has been to my knowledge considerable effort made for a betterment and improvement of conditions, and I think a considerable improvement is taking place. They are still behind in a good many cases. And this is also to be borne in mind: There are a great many cases that really present all the problems of lawsuits. Here is a woman who claims that she is the wife of a man, and entitled to certain compulsory allotment and allowance. The soldier disputes it, and there comes a question of fact. There is, of course, in some cases fraud practiced. There are some cases where actual facts can not immediately be ascertained. But in spite of that I still say there are many cases such as the gentleman has related where there seems to be no possible excuse for the failure of action on the part of the bureau.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations could not deal with the matter. We have no jurisdiction to make law, or to say who shall be at the head of the bureau or who shall not be at its head. All we can do is to vote the money, and we have voted the money, all that they can properly use, and we are prepared to vote it.

Mr. DENISON rose.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to say that I think if the Committee on Appropriations did have charge of the matter there would be probably considerable improvement over the present condition.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am obliged to the gentleman for the compliment; but I am not quite sure of that, because the task is really a very difficult one.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The question I wanted to refer to was this: The gentleman stated that there was a difference between compulsory and voluntary allotments, and he referred to the law requiring the filing of a new application. The question was, Does that apply to the voluntary allotment?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I think by and large that is true, but not always true.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. On whose initiative is the allotment made?

Mr. SHERLEY. The voluntary allotment must be made on the initiative of the soldier himself. Nobody else could do it.

Mr. EMERSON. And the compulsory allotment can be made on application by the dependent?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. There was a straightening up required at one time, incident to the fact I have spoken of, where under the law the amount of the allotment was dependent upon the amount of pay that the soldier was getting, and we passed an act through here, I think in June, undertaking to standardize it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. You referred a while ago to the voluntary allotment. Did you intend to include in your statement such voluntary allotments as required the Government to make an allowance to supplement them? There are two kinds of voluntary allotments, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. SHERLEY. I meant the allotment altogether aside from that which the Government supplements, and which is now paid through the War Department.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the law there may be voluntary allotments also?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Does the allowance come automatically?

Mr. SHERLEY. It comes automatically when there is proof of dependency.

Mr. EMERSON. But it must follow application?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. An application must be made in every case.

Mr. Sisson. I also think it is fair to say this in defense of the Bureau of War Risk, that all this trouble about correspondence and allotments being stopped was not due to any fault of the Bureau of War Risk. The greater part of it has been due to the change of the law regarding the method, and the fact that a great deal of this work was turned over to the War Department as to the voluntary allotments. For that reason all of the complaint is not against the War-Risk Bureau.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does not the gentleman think that an error was made originally in having any part of the soldier's pay transferred into the hands of the War-Risk Bureau? Is not that the basis of a good deal of the present trouble?

Mr. Sisson. No; I think myself that it all ought to have been handled in the Bureau of War Risk, to start with. If not, it ought to have been put into the War Department and all put in one place.

Mr. Treadway. And allowed to stay there?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. Since you have put it under the War-Risk Bureau I think everything that deals with insurance ought to be put with the War-Risk Bureau, and everything that deals with the boy as a soldier should be turned over to the Army.

Mr. Treadway. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. Sisson. I have no further desire to hold the floor. I simply wanted to make the statement that a great deal of the criticism that is being urged against the War-Risk Bureau was not just, because a great deal of it might be lodged against the War Department.

Mr. Treadway. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Treadway. During the past two weeks I have had opportunity of meeting the families, especially the mothers, of many boys in the service. I have continually been a strong advocate of the war-risk insurance and the manner in which the business of the department has been handled. I think it is a remarkable credit to the department that within a year's time such an enormous amount of work could be taken in charge and handled as well as it has been handled. I want to give it all due credit, but, nevertheless, whoever is responsible for this change that has recently been made, whether by law or regulation or by agreement between the two departments—the War-Risk Bureau and the Quartermaster Department—wherever that change comes from, it has been a source of the greatest discomfort to parents.

Mr. Sherley. If the gentleman will yield, I agree with him, and where it comes from is the law that the Congress of the United States enacted.

Mr. Treadway. I understand that to be the case, and that is the statement made when the War-Risk Bureau sent out the notices of the cancellation of the allotments. It so states on these cards. I think, however, that the statute to which the gentleman refers was not mandatory. But I want to say this in addition, that the method of notification to parents, and to others who have had the allotments sent them, has been very vague indeed. The notice has not been a plain statement. Perhaps we could understand it, knowing the law, but the average parent can not understand that notice, and out of more than 150 cases that have come to my attention within the past two weeks, I should say nearly half of them have contained that element of complaint, "Why has our allotment stopped?"

In connection with that same matter is the fact that the thousands of men overseas were obliged to receive their notifications from their commanding officer that their original allotment was stopped and that they must sign up a new form. Now, I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that during the period of that change some arrangement should have been made whereby the allotment should not have been stopped. They have been stopped in thousands and thousands of cases, undoubtedly, and it is absolutely impossible for the average person to understand the reason, particularly in view of the fact that it has required a new allotment to be signed by the men in the field, thousands and thousands of them overseas, and those allotments must get back here to the two departments before the change can be made and the new method of procedure put into effect. I think it is gross mismanagement somewhere, to the detriment of the service and to the detriment of the mental feeling, both of the men in the field and the parents or dependents here at home. I feel that it is as aggravating to the men and the families as the gross mismanagement in handling their mail. Coupled with the complaints about stopping allotments was almost an invariable complaint that the letters from home were not reaching the soldiers overseas.

I realize most fully the task of carrying on these departments, but I do think that when that change was required in the law a better system could have been found of putting the law into effect, and I think, as I stated, the men ought to have been allowed a continuance of the allotments in some way or other during the period of the change from the War-Risk Bureau to the quartermaster. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the payment of military and naval family allowances, as authorized by law, \$70,000,000.

Mr. Stafford. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of inquiring of the committee whether the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance has called upon the committee for any

funds to pay the insurance occasioned by the mortality of our soldiers abroad, and, if so, how much money has been expended by reason of the insurance taken out by the enlisted men and officers?

Mr. Sherley. They have an appropriation now that was made in the war risk act of last fall, I think, and they did not ask for any additional money, and the committee did not inquire as to what moneys had been paid under the insurance in effect.

Mr. Stafford. Of course they have the premiums that have been paid by the insured, which they can utilize for payment of the principal amount. The committee made no inquiry as to the total amount that has been imposed upon the Government in the payment of death losses?

Mr. Sherley. No; there being no deficiency asked, we did not have occasion to go into that.

Mr. Treadway. May I ask the chairman [Mr. Sherley] whether any statistics have reached his committee as to the number of allotments that have been reassigned under this change in form from the War-Risk Bureau to the Quartermaster's Department?

Mr. Sherley. I think that Gen. Lord, the Quartermaster General, made a statement about it. I do not recall it at the moment, but I will try and ascertain.

Mr. Treadway. I was wondering what percentage of the soldiers had failed to reassign, probably some through lack of desire to reassign, but a great many through failure to reach the men in the field.

Mr. Sherley. There have been a number of cases where there has been no reassignment, and some of them, as the gentleman suggests, have been the fault of the soldiers themselves.

Mr. Treadway. Undoubtedly, but—

Mr. Sherley. And some of them probably as the result of their not getting the notice, or not understanding it. I agree with what the gentleman has said, that a good deal of the information sent out has been of a character that was not clear to the ordinary layman. In fact, I have had some difficulty in understanding some of it myself, and I have always gone back to law to find out the rights of people rather than to the data that the bureau has sent out.

Mr. Treadway. I understand that the order making the change went by telegraph June 26 to all commanding officers, both in this country and abroad.

Mr. Madden. June 24.

Mr. Treadway. June 24, both in this country and abroad.

Mr. Sherley. Gen. Lord states:

Since these letters were written 247,000 new allotments have been received, and they are being paid as they are received, and I think there will be a cessation of these complaints; but back of it all, the condition of the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, with the extraordinary burden it was carrying and the great problem it faced, was the thought that anything we could take away from it to lighten the load we should do.

That was in explanation of why they took over this part of the work.

Mr. Treadway. I think there is some justice in that.

Mr. Eagan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sherley. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Eagan. Why was it necessary to stop payment of the allotments between the original assignments and the reassignments?

Mr. Sherley. The change in the law prevented the War-Risk Insurance people from continuing the payments, and the War Department had to have allotments in accordance with the law in order to enable them to begin the payments.

Mr. Eagan. So that the War-Risk Insurance Bureau had no choice except to stop the payments of the allotments?

Mr. Sherley. I think not, after the law was changed.

Mr. Tilson. I was called out of the hall for just a moment, and the gentleman may have made the explanation in my absence. Has he explained what takes place in regard to prisoners of war?

Mr. Sherley. There was a discussion earlier in the day—

Mr. Tilson. No; I mean this reallocation, where the soldiers are in German prisons and are therefore unable to be reached to sign the reallocations?

Mr. Sherley. No; I have not touched on that. In point of fact that particular situation had not occurred to my mind.

Mr. Tilson. It has occurred in my own experience in trying to straighten out a difficulty of that sort. A number of our first men that we sent over there have been captured and are in German prisons, and they are called upon to make reallocations, and, of course, it is impossible for them to make reallocations. I wondered if that had been brought to the attention of the gentleman and if there had been any provision to take care of such cases?

Mr. Sherley. It has not been brought to my attention.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman further in reference to Gen. Lord's testimony as to the 247,000 allotment cases, what proportion of them are from overseas? Is there any record of that?

Mr. SHERLEY. The testimony does not show.

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course that is the great difficulty. Undoubtedly of the 247,000 a very large percentage are from men in this country at various cantonments. The men to whose families we ought to endeavor to furnish the allotments with the least possible delay are those overseas, who can not understand why their families are deprived of the allotment, and whose families can not understand it, and we can not explain it to them.

Mr. SHERLEY. I agree with the gentleman, but all I can say is that the testimony was that the War Department was doing everything it could by repeated reminders to bring to the attention of all officers the need of notifying all the soldiers of the necessity of making this allotment.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think I may state that in my experience, in endeavoring to follow up the soldiers' allotments and allowances, I found but one instance where the allotment continued consecutively in its transfer from the War-Risk Bureau to the Quartermaster. I have but one case where during the change the allotment has not been stopped and more or less details necessary to get it started.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, gentlemen realize that we only hear about cases where something is wrong, but where the payments are regular we do not hear of it.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Has anything been done to help out the illiterates across the sea?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not answer the gentleman. I want to say this for the benefit of the House. Of course, it was perfectly impracticable for the committee to undertake a thorough investigation of the War-Risk Insurance or the War Department in connection with allotments. If we had done that, we would not have been able to report the bill. All that was before the committee was the question of moneys for the payment of salaries, and so forth. We did gather, however, knowing the interest of the House, as incident to the examination of witnesses, some information, but we did not cover the case the gentleman alludes to.

Mr. LAZARO. This question of illiterates merely adds to the difficulties we have to contend with.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. While this may not be within the province of the committee, does not the gentleman think that it is a mistake to split up the duties of these allotments and divide them between two different bureaus?

Mr. SHERLEY. I announced when this discussion started, an hour or more ago, that I thought there ought to be some consolidation and that Congress ought to undertake legislation looking to clarifying the whole situation, but it is a matter that ought not to be done hastily, because it is a difficult problem, and the legislative committee dealing with it ought immediately to go into the whole matter, with a view of clarifying and consolidating the bureaus.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. What does the gentleman think of this proposition, that an expert from the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance be detailed to the House Office Building to take up the complaints that come into the offices of Members of Congress, and so help take them off our hands and at the same time help the bureau handle the cases?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am fearful that such a person detailed would not be able really to help, without bringing the files of the office, and that you would not get the relief that the gentleman hopes for.

Mr. DENISON. I thought it might hasten it.

Mr. MADDEN. He would be a good additional clerk for Members of Congress.

Mr. DENISON. They will have to do that or the Committee on Appropriations will have to give us more for clerk hire, because the work is getting to be burdensome, although we are all anxious and willing to do it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct a statement I made to the effect that the War-Risk Bureau has 11,000 clerks. I have since ascertained that they have 14,000; that they have increased the number 4,000 in the last few weeks.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman mean to say that they have 14,000 clerks in that one bureau?

Mr. MADDEN. Fourteen thousand.

Mr. BUTLER. Whew! [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Fourteen thousand. I have letters in my possession to the effect that there is not a clerk down there who does more than one day's work in a week. I have further information that some clerks supposed to be working at night report for duty at 6 o'clock, immediately after making the report for duty go out to supper, and when the theater is open they go to the theater and never come back. If this kind of a situation exists, it is not to be wondered at that you can not get matters adjusted about which Members are complaining.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know what these 14,000 clerks are costing the Government?

Mr. MADDEN. No; but here is an additional appropriation of \$7,580,000 in this bill, with \$3,591,000 in the regular bill six months ago.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know how much the original appropriation was?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, they did not have 14,000 clerks at first; they keep adding a thousand or two every week, and now I see that somebody has been able to persuade the health officer of the District of Columbia, the District Commissioners, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and the Secretary of the Treasury to plead with the bureau not to bring any more clerks into the District until the epidemic is over. But there was no need of waiting until the epidemic is over; they are so crowded with clerks that that is what helps make the epidemic.

Some sleeping rooms are occupied by as many as 12 girls. I know of a case where the whole 12 have been sick with the influenza and not one able to help the other. Some people have asked why the 11, free from influenza, insisted on going into the room and sleeping where 1 girl was sick. The answer to that is that they had no other place to go; they could not sleep on the street, and they could not find a place in the hall of the house in which they had the room to sleep. Aside from all the iniquity of having these girls here under these circumstances, there is still greater iniquity in the determination of the heads of these bureaus to employ people regardless of whether they need them or not. The time has come when somebody, somewhere, must exercise the power that exists in the Government to prevent the extravagant waste of public funds and this criminal employment of unnecessary people. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. I find that this appropriation of \$7,580,000 is for officers and employees. Do they have officers in the War-Risk Bureau?

Mr. MADDEN. Not military officers. I suppose it means heads of bureaus.

Mr. BUTLER. Do they have any of these moving figures in uniform?

Mr. MADDEN. I understand not. But I want to relate another little experience that I had. One of the division heads of the War-Risk Insurance, whose name I am not permitted to use, came to see me the other day. He told me that the people in the office over which he presides are so thick, so crowded, that there is not standing space for them, to say nothing about desk space; that they have not any work for them to do; that there is no need for their services; and that there ought to be something done, regardless of the influenza, to stop the situation that exists.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How many would we have here if we did not have the influenza?

Mr. MADDEN. As many as they could get.

Mr. LAZARO. Does not the gentleman think this situation has been a little magnified? For instance, everyone agrees that all of the clerks who are brought here ought to work, ought to do their share.

Mr. MADDEN. But they all admit themselves that they are not doing it.

Mr. LAZARO. And the gentleman would not be in favor of issuing a blanket order to stop the Government from bringing clerks here, if clerks are needed to prosecute this war?

Mr. MADDEN. If clerks are needed?

Mr. LAZARO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I admit if clerks are needed or if anyone else is needed, I will go as far as any man in America will go to supply the needs; but when we know they are not needed, and when those in authority know they are not needed, and when they continue to insist upon the employment of those who are not needed and who themselves say they are doing no work, and who laugh on the streets at the ease with which they

can get money out of the Treasury of the United States, then it is time for some one somewhere to say something about it.

Mr. LAZARO. If there is a single clerk in the city of Washington who is not doing his or her duty, that clerk ought not to be employed.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course not.

Mr. LAZARO. But the gentleman understands that in a crisis like this sometimes we are liable to magnify things. The gentleman does not think they are systematically bringing people here who are not needed?

Mr. MADDEN. Absolutely, I do.

Mr. LAZARO. There is room for improvement, I admit; but the gentleman would not issue a blanket order to keep the Government from bringing clerks here who are needed to prosecute this war, because we have gripped here?

Mr. MADDEN. I will tell you what I would do, if I may be allowed to have one minute. I would issue a blanket order to send a committee of experts from either the House and the Senate or from some place in the executive branch of the Government to simplify, systematize, and regulate the conduct of these bureaus, so that no person would be there in any one of them who did not do a day's work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SLOAN and Mr. TREADWAY rose.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, can we not reach some agreement touching this debate? I have not wanted to in any way curtail it, but we have been talking for nearly an hour and a half altogether aside from what is really pending, which is the money to be appropriated. I hope the committee may be willing to make some progress on the bill now.

Mr. TREADWAY. Let me have three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate upon the pending paragraph end in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and all of the amendments thereto be concluded in three minutes. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The chair hears none and it is so ordered, and the gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] was to have the time. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] does not desire time now, as I understand.

Mr. SLOAN. I will be satisfied with two minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, I make the request for five minutes, and I hope the committee will hereafter expedite the progress of the bill. At the present rate, we will not be through for a week.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to vacate the order by which the debate was limited for three minutes and now asks that debate be concluded at the end of five minutes, two minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and three minutes by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use these two minutes for the purpose of emphasizing the necessity and the propriety of the organization of a joint committee of the House and Senate to look after the expenditures of these enormous sums of money that we are appropriating. The statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] concerning the large number of clerks here at high salaries, standing in each other's way, interfering with the management and control of this prevailing epidemic, ought to be at this time of such force and effect that it would impress itself upon those who are in charge of the legislation of this House so that they would organize such a committee of the best men of each side of this House and Senate to see to it that the money of the people of the country appropriated—not in thousands or millions but in billions of dollars as we are now—is not unwarrantably, lavishly, and extravagantly expended any longer as it is being done now in the manner stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have favored constantly the removal of numerous clerks from the city of Washington. There are very many departments that have no bearing whatever in being located here, and no reason therefor. I am on record some months ago of favoring the removal of a number of different bureaus to the centers where they should be for their proper work, but the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, Mr. Chairman, belongs here, and in spite of the criticisms of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] I think that bureau is deserving of the very highest commendation. To think that in

one year's time a bureau could be organized capable of writing nearly \$35,000,000 of insurance is something perfectly marvelous and almost beyond our comprehension.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am sorry, but my time is very short.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman one question—

Mr. TREADWAY. I say this further, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the very large amount of insurance carried and the very quick time in which it has been put into operation, and the fact that no policy can be issued for more than \$10,000, the expense of conducting that bureau and the fact that they are asking \$7,580,000 all told is not an unreasonable expenditure. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois perfectly that the clerks here ought to be expected to do a full day's work, men and women alike, but I do wish to uphold the manner in which the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance is performing its duty, the service it is rendering to the men in uniform, and the great benefit it is to the families of those men. We are asked to appropriate \$7,580,000 to handle that work, and it is none too much. It is carrying nearly twice, Mr. Chairman, the amount of life insurance in effect in this country at the breaking out of the war, and no life insurance companies could ever have written any such aggregate amount of insurance for the amount that has been expended, or is asked for by the Government in this appropriation bill. Naturally, mistakes occur, but I think, considering the enormous task it has, the work is as well done as we could expect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Chicago, Ill., post office, courthouse, etc.: For repairing damage done to the Adams Street entrance, \$22,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word or two in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. In the first place, the War-Risk Insurance Bureau is not being run efficiently. I make that charge on my responsibility as a Member of the House. I can prove it by 9 out of 10 of the people who are employed in it. I can prove it, further, by the failure of the bureau to accomplish the work for which it was organized within the time in which it should be accomplished. I make the charge that the bureau had \$3,591,000 appropriated for its maintenance just six months ago, and that to-day it comes in here for an additional appropriation as a deficiency of \$7,580,000.

Mr. WALSH. They asked for \$10,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. They asked for \$10,000,000, and the appropriation is for \$7,580,000. That makes a total appropriation within the last six months of \$11,171,000 to administer an institution that ought to be capable of functioning with 3,500 people. They have 14,000 people employed there now, and if this is an example of the understanding of the gentleman from Massachusetts of efficient administration of public affairs, I have not much respect for his knowledge of efficiency. It is the most inefficient, outrageously extravagant institution that was ever organized under the Government. It is true we are handling big things. We had a large number of cases. I realize the importance of the work, but when everybody in the service will unhesitatingly tell you they are not called upon to work; that the average number of hours they put in a week is one good day's work; that there are thousands of men and women who are supposed to be employed here making no kind of excuse for not performing the duty at all, or if they report, as I said a few moments ago, they leave immediately after reporting and make no pretense of working—now, if that is efficiency, if that is system, if that is commendable, why the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] can have it so. But I do not believe it is efficiency. I do not believe it is system. I do not believe it is commendable. It is unjustifiable. The American people are entitled to a proper administration of their affairs. This function of administering the War-Risk Bureau is important. The best reason in the world why it should be efficient is the importance of the case, the urgency of the need of the widows of the men who die upon the battle fields, of the mothers, of the wives who are at home and whose soldier husbands are at the front. Can there be any worse failure to realize that patriotic need of public service than the employment of 10 people to do 1 person's work and throw the money of the public into the gutter and at the same time fail to accomplish the need of these deserving people by the payment of their allotments in a systematic, regular, and prompt way?

Efficiency! Oh, it would make a dog laugh to talk about efficiency under such circumstances. It is criminal. And those who are responsible for the criminality involved in such

management ought in a time like this, when everybody is called upon to pay and bleed, to be prosecuted for their failure to observe the obligations which they took when they swore to protect and preserve the Constitution and the laws of the United States, as they must have done when they entered upon the discharge of the duties which devolve upon them by reason of their appointment to this office. Away with defense of the character made by the gentleman from Massachusetts of such an institution. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

East St. Louis, Ill., \$4,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. I hope the gentlemen will not continue a discussion that leads nowhere and is altogether aside from the bill. I have been generous with the membership of the House, but we can not hope to pass this bill for days if this sort of debate is to continue. Individual Members come to me and urge me to expedite the passage of the bill, and then delay the consideration of it. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not ask for further time.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CEMETERIES.

Disposition of remains, etc.: For the disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, civilian employees, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, fiscal years 1918 and 1919, \$710,274.52.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman a question. I am very sorry indeed that I did not hear the gentleman's statement the other day. I know it was lucidly made. I could not be here at the time. Will the gentleman tell me what is the occasion for this expenditure, which seems to be a large appropriation of money in a deficiency bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman mean the total bill?

Mr. BUTLER. No; this one item of \$710,274.52 for disposition of remains.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is for the purpose indicated, and, of course, the gentleman realizes that unfortunately there have been a number of deaths of men in the service.

Mr. BUTLER. But these are not abroad?

Mr. SHERLEY. This is for men who die while returning from abroad, and for the deaths of men who are in the service here in America.

Mr. BUTLER. I will confess I did not know that the Government paid for the burial of civil employees until I read this.

Mr. SHERLEY. It only pays for civil employees of the War Department, and that provision has existed for 20 or 30 years.

Mr. BUTLER. I presume it has; but it does not extend beyond that, does it?

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That purchase and exchange of typewriting machines, to be paid for from this appropriation, may be made at the special price allowed to schools teaching stenography and typewriting without obligating typewriter companies to supply these machines to all departments of the Government at the same price.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if there was anything said to his committee in regard to a new storehouse for the Watertown Arsenal?

Mr. SHERLEY. There were a number of items that were sent in as estimates which the Ordnance Department voluntarily withdrew. There was none submitted for a storehouse.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that last week I was at the Watertown Arsenal, where more than 12 large new buildings have recently been constructed and an enormous amount of work is being carried on, and the commandant told me that he had repeatedly reported to the authorities here in Washington the imperative need of a new storehouse for the arsenal. There is a lot of nickel and other valuable material used in the foundry in casting guns and in the manufacture of projectiles and there is no place to store it except out of doors. Moreover, there is a lot of machinery and a lot of metal and other material at the arsenal that deteriorates by being left out of doors, and there is also the continual chance of having valuable material, such as nickel, brass, and copper, stolen. It is perfectly evident that material of this kind ought to be kept under lock and key in a storehouse. I felt it my duty to call this matter to the attention of the committee, even if the Bureau of Ordnance did not consider it of sufficient importance to present it to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, no estimate was submitted for that object, and the committee therefore could not anticipate that need. In addition to that, there is

a general repair fund for the arsenal, and there is an amount carried here for the repair of arsenals. I suspect that the department ought to take care of the need as the gentleman seems to indicate.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks an appropriation for repairs could be used for such a purpose?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not for the construction of a new building, but it is frequently used for enlargements.

Mr. ROBBINS. This says "improvements" also in the same item.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the maintenance item is rarely used for new projects of any magnitude. Usually the commandants of these various arsenals are very much more insistent on what they consider the needs of the arsenals than are the men who are at the head of this branch of the Government. Gen. Compton has just recently made a visit to the arsenals, and I think that included the one that the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to. He was present at the hearings and testified within 10 days, and he did not speak of such a need as that at the Watertown Arsenal. He voluntarily withdrew some items.

Mr. DALLINGER. Do I understand that the officers who appeared before the committee did not ask for it?

Mr. SHERLEY. They did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That purchase and exchange of typewriting machines, to be paid for from this appropriation, may be made at the special price allowed to schools teaching stenography and typewriting without obligating typewriter companies to supply these machines to all departments of the Government at the same price.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee the reason for this special exemption. I recall that when the representatives of the typewriting companies came before the legislative subcommittee they requested that the law prescribing the low price at which the Government now secures its typewriters should be changed because of the increased cost. What is the purpose of this exempting provision?

Mr. SHERLEY. Just to carry the exact language that has been carried in the Army act for a number of years. It is a special price, lower than the Government price made to schools.

Mr. STAFFORD. What kind of schools, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. SHERLEY. Various schools—Indian schools, District of Columbia schools, and other Government schools.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I assume that this is for the purpose of qualifying the general law which gives the Government a fixed low price for its typewriters.

Mr. SHERLEY. This was supposed to get them for a fixed price lower than that price. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not that the purpose of this, that the Government is not to get the price at which they are furnished to the schools?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. It says "at the special price allowed to schools teaching stenography and typewriting."

Mr. STAFFORD. Without obligating the typewriter companies to supply these machines to all the departments of the Government at the same price?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; not having to supply all the other departments. This relates to schools.

Mr. STAFFORD. I inquire of the gentleman what schools—whether Government schools or otherwise? I should think it relates to private schools. I would assume from the reading of this provision that the purpose was that the Government was not to get the benefit of the low price at which typewriters were furnished to private commercial colleges.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is my understanding that they get the lowest possible price. This exact language was carried in the Army act touching this purchase.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read it it excepts the Government from getting that low price.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does not it apply to the coast-artillery school at Fort Monroe entirely, and made so that the school may be able to get these typewriters at a lower rate than the typewriter company furnishes them to all departments?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was the understanding I had.

Mr. SHERLEY. It gives the artillery school this special price which is a lower price than the special governmental price.

Mr. WALSH. While the point of order is reserved I would like to ask why the artillery school should be favored in this way.

Mr. SHERLEY. Because it is a school, because the typewriter company makes a special price of typewriters for schools; that is the only reason.

Mr. WALSH. It seems to me that if the typewriter companies can afford to furnish a special rate for schools, in view of the enormous quantities the Government uses in their departments, they might make a similar rate for all of them.

Mr. SHERLEY. The typewriter companies have been complaining for two years past that they are losing money on typewriters furnished the Government. I do not know the ancestry of this provision, but what probably happened years ago was that the typewriter companies, in order to get the use of typewriters more prevalent with the public, gave special prices to schools, and somebody learning of it insisted that the Government school should come in on the same basis. I do not know, but I only know that this is the language carried, and the purpose was to get typewriters at the cheapest possible price.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light to commissioned officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men on duty at places where no public quarters are available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserves and retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, and for every commissioned officer of the Army of the United States on duty in the field or on active duty without the territorial jurisdiction of the United States who maintains a place of abode for a wife, child, or dependent parent, for whom no public quarters are available. \$75,861,520.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Does this enlarge the law we passed some time this spring granting commutation of quarters, light, and heat only to those officers who are married?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is the exact language of the present Army act.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to make a further inquiry. The gentleman from Alabama will recall that there was a discussion on the floor of the House as to whether we should extend commutation of quarters to officers who are unmarried, and I wish to inquire whether under this phraseology it would be practicable to extend the commutation to such officers?

Mr. DENT. I think the gentleman from Kentucky has answered the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have not read the language critically. If the gentleman will notice, it says in the latter part officers who maintain a place of abode for a wife, child, or dependent parent for whom no public quarters are available.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire further whether this large amount was not occasioned largely by the passage of that law.

Mr. DENT. Unquestionably; that was new legislation, and up to that time officers in the field had no right to commutation of quarters.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation for "Pay of the Army" for the fiscal year 1919 shall be available to pay 1,289 field clerks at the rate of \$1,200 per annum, the minimum or entrance rate fixed by the Army appropriation act approved July 8, 1918, instead of at \$1,000 per annum, the rate appropriated in the said act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the paragraph. What is the reason for raising the pay from \$1,000 to \$1,200?

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not raise the pay. The Army act of July 8, 1918, provided that hereafter the minimum pay should be \$1,200, but the appropriation was made for clerks at \$1,000 as a minimum, and it was simply an error in failing to take up one line that had been changed by a subsequent one, and so in order to carry out the law, which says that they shall come in at \$1,200, we provide that they shall be paid \$1,200 instead of \$1,000, which they were appropriated for.

Mr. DENT. The increase of pay from \$1,000 to \$1,200 was put on in the Senate and was agreed to in conference, and in writing the amount in the bill the conferees did not carry the full amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then this is largely to correct the clerical error—

Mr. DENT. It is to carry out the legislation that was put on the bill increasing the minimum pay from \$1,000 to \$1,200.

Mr. SHERLEY. The paragraph which allowed 1,287 clerks at \$1,000 each was not in conference. What was in conference was

the provision that the minimum or entrance pay, exclusive of said allowances of said Army clerks, shall be \$1,200 per annum. When that was agreed to it necessarily made imperative a change in language that I have previously read so that we make this apply to existing law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clothing and camp and garrison equipage: For clothing and camp and garrison equipage, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$59,138,433, and in addition thereto the sum of \$108,376,182 of the amount appropriated for "Regular supplies, Quartermaster Corps" in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, is made available for the foregoing purposes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I see in line 20, page 16, the language "members of the Officers' Reserve Corps." Has not the distinction between members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the other officers been wiped out?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is possible. We simply followed the exact language that is used, and it is possible that there may be some of these old accounts still to be paid to individuals who at the time the mileage was incurred were members of the Officers' Reserve Corps.

Mr. TILSON. And it would require that language to cover them?

Mr. SHERLEY. So it is highly desirable to continue the language.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his motion for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad if the gentleman would move now that the committee rise.

Mr. SHERLEY. All right.

Mr. MONDELL. I rose for the purpose of making the same inquiry.

Mr. SHERLEY. Before making that motion may I say to the committee, I hope in perfect good humor, that if we are to pass this bill to-morrow it is necessary that we all try to confine ourselves to the discussion of things directly involved in the bill. I hope the committee will cooperate in that consideration of the measure. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 10609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the present Federal building site at Eatonton, Ga., for another site on the public square in said city.

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces.

RESERVE OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 63, providing for a reserve of the Public Health Service, and that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution. The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 63, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. DOREMUS, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. ESCH.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GALLIVAN, for six days, on account of illness;
To Mr. ZIEHLMAN, indefinitely, on account of illness; and
To Mr. McKEOWN, for 15 days, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a telegram from the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. LONERGAN, asking that his leave of absence be extended indefinitely. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. LITTLE. I ask leave to address the House for two minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman kindly withhold that until to-morrow?

Mr. LITTLE. Certainly, if the gentleman wishes it.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE STERLING OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I rise to announce the death, at Pontiac, Ill., to-day, in an automobile accident, of our colleague, Hon. JOHN A. STERLING, of Illinois.

At some future time I will ask the House to pause in its ordinary business, in order to pay appropriate tribute to the life, character, and public services of our distinguished friend. I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 446.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN A. STERLING, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of 20 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the committee in the morning.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, October 18, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Industries Board for the remainder of the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1330); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Chemical Warfare Service of the War Department for the fiscal year 1919, in lieu of the estimate heretofore submitted (H. Doc. No. 1331); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been presented to this department and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 1332); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund (H. Doc. No. 1333); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13015) to amend so much of an

act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, as provided for "longevity pay for men other than the Regular Army," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 831), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII.

Mr. SCULLY introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 337) to enable prompt liquidation of claims for damages to persons and property occasioned by an explosion or explosions at the plant of the T. A. Gillispie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 13095) granting an increase of pension to Capt. John T. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 13096) granting a pension to Joseph F. Mangold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13097) granting an increase of pension to Josiah T. McMillan; to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 13098) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Holley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13099) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 13100) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Hunnewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII.

Mr. MAGEE laid on the Clerk's desk a petition of members of Skaneateles Grange, No. 458, Onondaga County, N. Y., against the postal zone rate system, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, October 18, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our heavenly Father, whose ways are past finding out, we come to Thee with bowed heads and sorrowing hearts because of the widespread desolation throughout the land. Thousands are passing to the unseen, leaving homes and hearts desolate.

Again we as a body have been touched with sorrow and grief because of the death of another Member of this House—a real representative of the people, a patriot, a statesman, wise in his counsels, a strong advocate of what he believed to be right.

He is gone. We mourn his going, and by the blessed angel of faith help us, his widow, and all who knew and loved him to look forward to the life eternal, for there is no death.

I long for household voices gone,
For vanished smiles I long;
But God hath led my dear ones on,
And He can do no wrong.

I know not what the future hath
Of marvel or surprise,
Assured alone that life and death
His mercy underlies.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BESHILIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BESHILIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on the 23d day of last month, when the House had under consideration the Senate amendment to House bill 11945, to stimu-